DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 717 UD 005 193

By-Mintz, Sidney W.

Puerto Rico: An Essay in the Definition of a National Culture.

Pub Date 66

Note-96p.; Article published in "Status of Puerto Rico: Selected Background Studies." Washington, D.C., G.P.O., 1966.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.90

Descriptors-Attitudes, Background, Bibliographies, Community Study, *Cultural Environment, Culture, Family (Sociological Unit), History, *Literature Reviews, *Puerto Rican Culture, Puerto Ricans, Race Relations, Social Change, Social Class, *Values

Identifiers-Caribbean Nations, Puerto Rico

This extensive essay, part of a volume of studies on Puerto Rico, presents various views of Puerto Rican culture. Puerto Rico's role in the history of the Caribbean region and Puerto Rican attitudes and values are described, and in a survey of pertinent literature, works on the Puerto Rican family, community, race relations, and social change are discussed. (A bibliography is included) An introduction to this essay defines the general concept of culture. (LB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PUERTO RICO: AN ESSAY IN THE DEFINITION OF A NATIONAL CULTURE

by

SIDNEY W. MINTZ

Professor of Anthropology, Yale University

Professor Mintz is the author of "Worker in the Cane, a Puerto Rican Life History" and "People of Puerto Rico" (with Julian Seward).

> Every culture seems, as it advances toward maturity, to produce its own determining debate over the ideas that preoccupy it: salvation, the order of nature, money, power, sex, the machine and the like. The debate, indeed, may be said to be the culture, at least on its loftiest levels; for a culture achieves identity not so much through the ascendancy of one particular set of convictions as through the emergence of its peculiar and distinctive dialogue * * * Intellectual history, properly conducted, exposes not only the dominant ideas of a period, or of a nation, but more importantly, the dominant clashes over ideas. Or to put it more austerely: the historian looks not only for the major terms of discourse but also for major pairs of opposed terms which, by their very opposition, carry discourse forward. The historian looks, too, for the coloration or discoloration of ideas received from the sometimes bruising contact of opposites.
>
> As he does so and as he examines the personalities and biases of the men engaged in debate at any given movement, the historian is likely to discover that the development of the culture in question resembles a protracted and broadly ranging conversation: at best a dialogue—a dialogue which at times moves very close to drama.—R. W. B. Lewis, "The American Adam; Innocence, Tragedy, and Tradition in the Nineteenth Century" (Chicago, 1955), pp. 1–2.

CONTENTS

Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 340
INTRODUCTION 340
PART I. CULTURE AS A TERM OF REFERENCE 341
    A. Anthropological Versus Literary Views of Culture 341
    B. "Culture" and "Society" as Paired Concepts 344
    C. The Problem of "Class Culture" 347
    D. "Genuine" Versus "Spurious" Culture 349
    E. The Terminology of Culture Change 351
    F. The Culture Concept as a Political Instrument 353
    G. Culture as an Historical Aggregate 355
PART II. PUERTO RICO IN THE CARIBBEAN SETTING 361
PART III. SOME VIEWS OF PUERTO RICAN CULTURE 366

Article published in "Status of Puerto Rico: Selected Background Studies." Washington D.C., G.P.O., 1966.

ED023717
UD 005 193

CONTENTS—Continued

	Page
PART IV. CONCLUSIONS	380
APPENDIX A	388
APPENDIX B	400
Community Studies	401
Race Relations Studies	405
Puerto Rican Family Structure and Attitudes	408
National Culture, National Character, National Values	414
Studies of Change	426
Summary	430
BIBLIOGRAPHY	430
FOOTNOTES	434

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to Mrs. Jane Collier and to Mrs. Caroline Logan for research and editorial assistance. Mrs. Collier examined and summarized numerous articles and books dealing with Puerto Rico, made a special application of Clyde Kluckhohn's values scheme in the Puerto Rican case (employing a revision prepared by Dr. B. N. Colby under NIMH grant No. M-4975), and contributed useful suggestions concerning the report. Much of the material in the appendices was prepared by Mrs. Collier.

I am also grateful to Mrs. Evelyn Middleton for having typed the draft for submission to the Commission and to fellow scholars for criticism and comment.

Friends in Puerto Rico, including Charles Rosario, Belén Barbosa de Rosario, Eustaquio Zayas and Elisabeth Villaronga, helped me prepare to write the report, and I am, as always, in their debt.

My wife, Jacqueline, read the draft version, and made many useful suggestions.

Responsibility for the report (including the errors it no doubt contains) is entirely my own.

JULY 1965. SIDNEY W. MINTZ.

INTRODUCTION

This essay deals with the writings of social scientists on the nature of Puerto Rican culture, and seeks to clarify some of the concepts they use. I have drawn mainly from scholars in sociology and anthropology; where relevant, the views of observers in related fields are included.

The special qualities of Puerto Rican culture have been a matter of intense concern to Puerto Rican intellectuals. This is entirely expectable, in view of Puerto Rico's lengthy history as a dependent society, its insularity, and the very spirited debate of recent years concerning its identity and political future. But I think that a rather disappointing fuzziness has marked this dialogue, so far as the definition of the term "culture" is concerned. Those who write about Puerto Rico so often seem to be governed by deeply felt, but not very specific, convictions, that I believed some examination of terms might be useful.

It may also serve some purpose to fix a discussion of Puerto Rican culture within the context of island history, and of Puerto Rico's place within the Caribbean region. In terms of the history of Western oversea expansion, Puerto Rico is part of the oldest colonial area in the world. Furthermore, it was one of the last colonies of Spain to be surrendered to foreign domination in this hemisphere. Because of certain underlying features of geography and history, Puerto Rico does, indeed, share much with mainland Latin America; along different lines, Puerto Rico both shares, and does not share, features characteristic of the Caribbean area as a whole. In order to weigh Puerto Rico's distinctive quality as a society and to separate out its particularity from the rest of the Hispanic world, some attention is given to the island's culture history.

An attempt is also made to report some observations on the character of Puerto Rican society over a period of time, and in the present. This part of the discussion is more summary than interpretation; but little will be gained by dealing with terminology, social science concepts, and history, unless one is prepared to deal, at least tentatively, with the nature of island society as contemporary observers have perceived it.

The essay's concern is with culture—its definition, its relevance, and its particular meaning in the Puerto Rican case. To a major extent, political implications are not spelled out. The hope is, however, that the political dialogue may be clarified by achieving some common agreement on terms.

PART I. CULTURE AS A TERM OF REFERENCE

A. ANTHROPOLOGICAL VERSUS LITERARY VIEWS OF CULTURE

The term "culture" has been used for many years and in various ways by writers, both social scientists and belletrists. From the literary or esthetic point of view, culture usually refers to the intellectual product of a society's leaders in the fields generally associated with the esthetic experience, such as the graphic arts, music, drama, and literature. Using "culture" to mean an elite esthetic product is a common practice. Used this way, the term does not refer directly to the esthetic effort of "the people," but rather to that of some specialist class or societal group that concerns itself in particular with esthetic productivity.

The history of human society has repeatedly shown the ways in which the esthetic products of "the folk" are distilled, given new symbolic meanings, and synthesized, to produce culture in this more refined sense. Thus we feel no surprise in learning that Beethoven employed popular leitmotifs in the writing of classical compositions; nor are we startled by the revelation that African "primitive art" often inspired French modern painters.

In the work of anthropologist Robert Redfield, the dichotomy between "the culture of the folk" and "elite culture" expresses another dichotomy: that between "the little society" and "the great society" (e.g. 1962: 302). The historical process of nation-building or national integration is always likely to produce certain distinctions in esthetic products, setting apart those of the people at large from those of specialists in the fields of "culture." But this distinction reflects structural distinctions within the society. Whether one prefers Charles Ives or rock-and-roll is a matter of "taste," and taste reflects—among other things—social-structural differences. Elite cultural forms can not be shown to be better or finer or more esthetic on any convincing objective grounds, any more than one dialect of a language can be scientifically proved superior to any other. Cultural forms, in other words, do not lend themselves to quality measurement according to any scale but taste itself.

The anthropological view must be reserved whenever claims are made that one sort of culture is in any way demonstrably better than any other. To the anthropologist, culture is a concept applicable to all those products of the human species that are the result of social learning, communicated through the use of a symbol system, and not rooted in the purely physiological character of man as a species.

The classic anthropological definition of culture is that of Edward B. Taylor, the great British anthropologist whose work marked the emergence of anthropology as a professional discipline: "* * * that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society" (1877: 1).

American anthropologists, in explicating the culture concept, commonly assert that man is the only animal who makes tools and continues to use them in cumulative ways; that man is the only animal whose principal mode of communication is through a symbolic system, embodied in language; that man is the only animal the evolution of whose social life was based in the first instance on the subjugation of basic physical impulses to some organized system of behavior, invented by man himself. It is in these terms that culture is claimed to be a distinctively human product. Culture, then, co-occurs with humanity. It is in no way the monopoly of some societies as opposed to others, or of some classes or specialist groups within a society, as opposed to others within that same society.

To the anthropologist, rock-and-roll is as much a part of culture as Ives; and pop art as much a part of culture as the works of a Chagall or a Picasso. Culture, in short, is by definition part of the environment within which any human being grows. To a very large extent, one takes on one's culture as one gets it; from birth onward, the human infant is busily engaged in clothing itself with the habiliments of its culture, as part of the price of becoming human. But "human" here is defined in terms of a particular set of values, beliefs, and symbolic meanings. One famous anthropologist has said that one never fully perceives one's own culture—that this would be as difficult to do as for a fish to discover that it lived in water. In fact, of course, cultures do become perceptible, and particularly when one can enjoy the perspective provided by coming to know well a culture different from one's own. Anthropology's special contribution to human understanding may very well be little more than this—to help man to perceive better the particular nature of one's own culture by assimilating the experience of the shock of contrast.

Robert Redfield defined culture as "* * * an organization of conventional understandings, manifest in act and artifact" (1941: 133). The use of the phrase "conventional understandings" is significant, because it says something both about what culture is, and about how it "works." What the culture concept does, among other things, is allow us to characterize the extent to which people who live within a particular society are able to operate confidently and efficiently in terms of endless everyday predictions about the behavior of others. Matters of dress, cuisine, etiquette, linguistic usage, and myriad other features of daily experience can only maintain their continuity because the members of a given society have certain commonly-accepted bases of agreement on what is both appropriate and acceptable.

From this point of view, it seems reasonable to argue that, when we speak of "Puerto Rican culture" or "American culture," we are referring first of all to those features of human behavior in each society which can be regarded as commonly accepted or agreed upon. It is of course true that each culture leaves considerable room for variation in behavior, either in the form of acceptable behavioral or valuational alternatives, or in the form of spheres of continuing controversy. Functioning in American society, for instance, does not require that one accept one, and only one, political view, style of dress, or religion. But the lack of utter uniformity that a culture may leave room for does not mean that the terms by which people act lack definition or predictability. It only means that large portions of daily activity, and many spheres of attitude and belief, are defined as falling within conventionally accepted areas of maneuver and difference.

However remote this discussion may seem from the question of Puerto Rican culture, I believe that it is of considerable relevance. Many writers on Puerto Rican culture seem quite unable—or perhaps unwilling—to make clear that they have in mind when using the term. "Puerto Rican culture" may be used to describe the speaking of Spanish; it may refer to the eating of rice and beans and the drinking of sweetened black coffee; it may refer to the novels and plays of a Laguerre, or the short stories of a González. It can mean many things or few; elite culture or popular culture; poor man's culture or rich man's culture. But unless and until the antagonists in this dialogue can make clear in what sense they are employing the term, they run the risk of continuing to waste words and effort without the achievement of clarity.

B. "CULTURE" AND "SOCIETY" AS PAIRED CONCEPTS

In American anthropological usage "culture" and "society" are intimately related but conceptually distinct terms. While the controversy concerning the meaning and employment of these terms continues, it is necessary to make some attempt here to counterpose them and to suggest their relationship. I use the term "society" here to refer to any organized group of human beings whose group nature can be circumscribed or delimited, and which has a continuity in time considerably greater than that of a single generation. This does not mean that small aggregates, or technically simpler ones, are excludable. We speak, for instance, of an American Indian society such as the Cheyenne, or the Hopi; or of an African society such as the Tallensi, or the Nuer. These are "tribal" societies, but the term society need not be restricted to groupings any more elaborate or technically more advanced than these. Smaller groups yet—say, the individual bands of Bushmen in Bechuanaland—are also societies. But the point is that each of these societies can be delimited, and set apart from the societies of its neighbors; that each has group continuity extending over generations, and that each fulfills the basic needs (biological, political, economic, etc.) of its people for continued group survival.

It would probably be proper to say that there is a body of behavior, and of the results of behavior, attaching to each of these societies, and to refer to this body of acts and artifacts as the substance of culture. Such a usage—admittedly put very loosely here—is consistent with anthropology's view. The people who live in some continuing organized group are the society, and the "carriers" of its culture. But men are mortal, and the personnel of a society move through it, from birth to death, while it endures. Its particular form—its internal divisions, its array of statuses and attached roles, its subgroupings, give to a particular society a characteristic structure or shape. There is no society without people; but people do not live in a society in some random scattering. Rather, they live as members of defined internal segments or sections through which successive generations move in patterned ways. Thus the term "society" may be seen here as referring to a kind of map or chart of some organized human grouping having continuity in time. It consists of a number of positions or slots filled by individuals who stand in certain relationships to each other. Societal subgroupings—for instance, those based on kinship, coresidence, common profession, common interest, and so forth—form segments of a total society. Over time, we take note, one generation replaces another; the society, then, is both an organized aggregate of people and an arrangement of parts, of social positions, through which mortal individuals move.

We are told by some writers that "a society consists of people; the way they behave is their culture." But this way of drawing the distinction between culture and society is not altogether helpful. Culture is a historical product. It takes on its characteristic nature, in a given society, over a period of time. And it is not integral, in the sense that all of its features are uniformly apprehended and employed by all of the society's members. No individual in any society ever has a total knowledge of overview of his culture. This means that in some sense a culture is supra-individual. The culture of one society is never entirely shared by all of its members at any point in time—even in the technically simplest and smallest societies, there are significant behavioral differences between men and women, and between the young, the adult, and the aged.

It is clear enough that, to some extent at least, distinctions within a given society are marked by differences in behavior between the members of different segments. On one level, everyone in a definable society participates through a common body of belief and behavior—that is, of culture. But on another, they differ in their behavior and in the ways that they are members of the society, in terms of those parts of the total culture which they do or do not employ. Since behavioral differences do denote differences of status and of differential group membership within some particular society, culture can serve as a means for expressing symbolically: (*a*) the maintenance of these differences; or (*b*) changes in status through accompanying changes in cultural forms. A person who changes his class position in American society, for instance, usually changes such features of his life as his habits of dress, cuisine, and possibly even speech. When he does so, he has not entirely changed his culture; but he may very well be taking on new "cultural" forms as an expression of his change of "social" position. One specific, if trivial, example of this should suffice.

The use of knives as eating instruments in Puerto Rican lower class rural subcultures has not yet appeared in strength; one eats normally with soup spoon and fork only. Yet knife-using is typical of the table etiquette of middle class Puerto Rico. When a person of lower class rural antecedents enters into middle class life by virtue of his own upward mobility and increased purchasing and consuming power, it is likely that his table etiquette will eventually change along with many other features of his daily behavior. But the acquisition of knife-using represents a change in individual usage within the culture, rather than a change in the totality of Puerto Rican culture as such. Knife-using, in other words, serves as a marker or boundary in daily behavior; it characterizes a difference in class position; and it can be used to symbolize a change in such position. In like fashion, a particular cultural usage—again, such as knife-using—serves to express symbolically the maintenance of societal distinctions. The child of middle class parents learns to use a knife from infancy, and learns to regard the usage as correct, expectable, and "natural." He will perceive non-knife-using as incorrect, surprising, and not "natural"; as he puts his observations together, he may perceive a whole constellation of behavior traits as characteristic of a certain "sort" of person. That sort of person is also Puerto Rican, but not of the same category as the observer. Thus behavioral differences maintain symbolically the societal distinction between members of different groups within a single society.

The concepts of "culture" and "society," then, give us different vantage points for looking at the same thing: human behavior. Culture consists of a body of historically accumulated usages and forms; society consists of the arrangement of people into various groupings which, taken all together, make up some total, aggregate, delimitable, human grouping.

Wolf has put this distinction provocatively, as he contrasts cultural and social anthropology:

> By culture I mean the historically developed forms through which the members of a given society relate to each other. By society I mean the element of action, of human maneuver within the field provided by cultural forms, human maneuver which aims either at preserving a given balance of life chances and life risks or at changing it. Most 'cultural' anthropologists have seen cultural forms as so limiting that they have tended to neglect entirely the element of human maneuver which flows through these forms or around them, presses against their limits or plays several sets of forms against the middle. It is possible, for instance, to study the cultural phenomenon of ritual coparenthood ("compadrazgo") in general terms: to make note of its typical form and general functions. At the same time, dynamic analysis should not omit note of the

> different uses to which the form is put by different individuals, of the ways in which people explore the possibilities of a form, or of the ways in which they circumvent it. Most social anthropologists, on the other hand, have seen action or maneuver as primary, and thus neglect to explore the limiting influence of cultural forms. Cultural form not only dictates the limits of the field for the social play, it also limits the direction in which the play can go in order to change the rules of the game, when this becomes necessary * * *. Past culture certainly structures the process of perception, nor is human maneuver always conscious and rational; by taking both views—a view of cultural forms as defining fields for human maneuver, and a view of human maneuver always pressing against the inherent limitations of cultural forms—we shall have a more dynamic manner of apprehending the real tensions of life (1959: 142).

Discussions of Puerto Rico that treat it as a unitary society with a unitary culture fail to clarify this distinction.

C. THE PROBLEM OF "CLASS CULTURE"

In the views of some, a national culture consists of a series of strata or levels of distinctive behavior within a single society. Social theorists who insist that social relations may be viewed basically as stemming from differences in access to the means of production, are likely to contend also that behavior in differing social segments is a reflection of differing group economic positions. Since the notion of "class" has come to be more widely accepted among American social scientists—say, in the past thirty years—various attempts have been made to describe what can be referred to as "subcultures" in terms of differing group economic positions. Even the half-facetious discussions of "highbrow, middlebrow, and lowbrow cultures" employed the notion that cultural forms are attached to differences in economic level; and the British discussions of "U" and "non-U" share something with this point of view.

Distinctions of this sort have their uses. In societies in which significant differences may be drawn between rural and urban segments, and among the economic positions occupied by various strata, class as a tool of analysis has a particular utility. That utility depends to a certain extent on the degree of rigidity which characterizes a total social system—that is, on the limitations to easy social and economic movement up and down. Societies which are, or have been, rigid in form, and lacking large numerical groupings which might be referred to as "middle class," are perhaps particularly suitable for analysis on these terms. Thus, within a society such as Puerto Rico's, we can readily localize differences in understanding, act, and in artifact which serve to characterize differential segments within the whole; and we can say with some reliability that movement from one such segment to another is normally accompanied by changes in "culture." In my own work on Puerto Rico, I early attempted to define a numerically substantial social segment which I referred to as the "rural proletariat" (Mintz, 1951a); this grouping within Puerto Rico was viewed primarily in terms of its economic position or productive relations within the total Island society. In several later papers and books (Mintz 1953a, 1953b, 1960; Steward 1956), the theme is enlarged in certain regards. Oscar Lewis' work on the "culture of poverty" takes a different conceptual tack, and yet concerns itself as well with the analysis of culture viewed to some extent as an aspect of economic status.

Serious questions remain, however, with regard to such concepts. Very importantly, it is often extremely difficult to determine whether a particular mode of behavior may properly be included under the rubric "class culture" or whether it may more correctly be seen as a variant on "national culture." In the case of a society such as Puerto Rico, for instance, distinctions must also be drawn between those items of act and artifact that are employed by members of different social segments and come from the historically accumulated body of Puerto Rican culture, and those that represent either innovations or introductions, and which diffuse at differential rates through various social groupings within the society.

To take several obvious examples, the "décima" is a traditional musical form in Puerto Rico, which has long been regarded as an integral part of the culture of that society. At the present time, décimas continue to be sung and composed mainly by rural people in Puerto Rico, normally and conventionally by members of lower class groupings. It would be correct to say that these musical forms do not form part of the contemporary culture of members of other classes, except to the extent that they may occasionally be listened to. Yet the décima, along with many other cultural items, has taken on a symbolic character in the continuing controversy concerning Puerto Rican culture; members of other groups, and perhaps particularly of that referred to as the "intellectual elite" vaunt the décima as an integral feature of the culture. It cannot be ignored that those who employ the décima as a political symbol—for that is the way it is manipulated—neither compose nor sing this form. Its presence within the total body of Puerto Rican culture is indisputable. But the way in which it forms a part of life, and is or is not employed, differs dramatically from one group to another, and the difference is probably not wholly attributable to differences in class.

In contrast, one may mention the use of pants as an article of feminine apparel in Island society. Slacks wearing by women is a mode of behavior clearly introduced from outside the Island society. This innovation was taken up first by members of middle or upper class groupings, and only diffused downward in the class structure over a substantial period of time. During a recent visit to the Island, I was struck by the extent to which slacks wearing has now become a part of the culture of rural lower class girls and women. Not only are denim slacks worn by young girls of lower class status in rural communities on the South Coast, but slacks are also worn under dresses by female field hands, who are members of one of the lowliest economic segments of Island society. But it is by no means analytically sufficient to say simply that a new cultural form has been introduced from the outside, and how it has now diffused to female members of all classes. The symbolic attachments to an innovation of this kind naturally vary significantly from one group to another, and only when some sense can be made of the symbolic (and utilitarian) values attached to such an item of behavior can any useful analytic comment be attempted.

And yet the concept of "class culture" adds importantly to our capacity to interpret analytically what the cultural character of Puerto Rico is like. Unfortunately, few social science studies of contemporary Puerto Rican society have extended this sort of analysis into new areas. The extent to which behavior may be viewed as a function of class position, and the extent to which interpretive derivations may be made from the symbolic meanings linked to such usages must depend on careful additional research. I will, however, employ the notion of class culture in this paper, wherever it may seem to apply usefully.

D. "GENUINE" VERSUS "SPURIOUS" CULTURE

In one of the most provocative essays in the literature of anthropology, Edward Sapir asked whether it was possible to describe cultures under the rubrics "genuine" and "spurious." His essay on this subject ([1924] 1956) excited response among social scientists, particularly because his view was plainly laden with considerable attribution of ethical and psychological value to one kind of culture as opposed to another, and modern, large-scale, complex societies came off rather badly. Sapir makes clear that he is not using these value-terms with reference to levels of technical development; a technically undeveloped society may have a "genuine" culture, while a highly evolved industrial society may have a "spurious" culture. Thus he writes:

> The genuine culture is not of necessity either high or low; it is merely inherently harmonious, balanced, self-satisfactory. It is the expression of a richly varied and yet somehow unified and consistent attitude toward life, an attitude which sees the significance of any one element of civilization in its relation to all others. It is, ideally speaking, a culture in which nothing is spiritually meaningless, in which no important part of the general functioning brings with it a sense of frustration, of misdirected or unsympathetic effort * * *.

> It should be clearly understood that this ideal of a genuine culture has no necessary connection with what we call efficiency. A society may be admirably efficient in the sense that all its activities are carefully planned with reference to ends of maximum utility to the society as a whole, it may tolerate no lost motion, yet it may well be an inferior organism as a culture-bearer. It is not enough that the ends of activities be socially satisfactory, that each member of the community feel in some dim way that he is doing his bit toward the attainment of a social benefit. This is all very well so far as it goes, but a genuine culture refuses to consider the individual as a mere cog, as an entity whose sole *raison d'être* lies in his subservience to a collective purpose that he is not conscious of or that has only a remote relevancy to his interests and strivings. The major activities of the individual must directly satisfy his own creative and emotional impulses, must always be something more than a means to an end. The great cultural fallacy of industrialism, as developed up to the present time, is that in harnessing machines to our uses it has not known how to avoid the harnessing of the majority of mankind to its machines. The telephone girl who lends her capacities, during the greater part of the living day, to the manipulation of a technical routine that has an eventually high efficiency value but that answers to no spiritual needs of her own is an appalling sacrifice to civilization. As a solution of the problem of culture she is a failure—the more dismal the greater her natural endowment. As with the telephone girl, so, it is to be feared, with the great majority of us, slave-stokers to fires that burn for demons we would destroy, were it not that they appear in the guise of our benefactors. The American Indian who solves the economic problem with salmon spear and rabbit snare operates on a relatively low level of civilizaton, but he represents an incomparably higher solution than our telephone girl of the questions that culture has to ask of economics. There is here no question of the immediate utility, of the effective directness, of economic effort, nor of any sentimentalizing regrets as to the passing of the "natural man." The Indian's salmon spearing is a culturally higher type of activity than that of the telephone girl or mill hand simply because there is normally no sense of spiritual frustration during its prosecution, no feeling of subservience to tyrannous yet largely inchoate demands, because it works in naturally with all the rest of the Indian's activities instead of standing out as a desert patch of merely economic effort in the whole of life. A genuine culture cannot be defined as a sum of abstractly desirable ends, as a mechanism. It must be looked upon as a sturdy plant growth, each remotest leaf and twig of which is organically fed by the sap at the core. And this growth is not here meant as a metaphor for the group only; it is meant to apply as well to the individual. A culture that does not build itself out of the central interests and desires of its bearers, that works from general ends to the individual, is an external culture. The word "external" which is so often instinctively chosen to describe such a culture, is well chosen. The genuine culture is internal, it works from the individual to ends (Sapir, 1956: 90–93).

To quote thus briefly from one of the most eloquent essays ever written on the subject of culture is to do serious injustice to Sapir's thinking. His major point, of course, is to suggest that we search for some reckoning of culture as a means both to express and to satisfy fundamental individual needs for fulfillment. His contentions work against the conception of the culture as simply an aspect of large-scale political units, and against the common inclination to see culture itself as a kind of automatic byproduct of technical excellence. What Sapir is not able to do in his essay is to explain in an entirely satisfactory way precisely how peoples in given societies may undertake to rationalize their cultures in a more organically coherent direction. I find it suprising that, to my knowledge, none of the writers on Puerto Rican culture has employed the Sapir essay in evaluating critically the place of that culture in the sphere of Western society. It is not entirely clear whether the Sapir formulation really carries significant implications of a political kind—even though such implications may be derived inferentially from what he has written. The point is this: can it be contended on any grounds that Puerto Rican culture—once some agreed-upon definition of its character can be reached—can grow more coherently under one set of political arrangements, than under another? The question clearly remains to be answered.

Surely, if one takes Sapir's criteria at face value, North American culture may seem as spurious as any, and more than most. If any writer on Puerto Rican culture has argued on such grounds in defense of a separate identity for Puerto Rico, the argument is not known to me. But more than a hint of this view may be found in Pedreira's classic "Isularismo": "La civilización es horizontal; la cultura, vertical. Si yo fuera a sumarme al grupo que todo lo define en términos del más y del menos, diría que hoy somos más civilizado, pero ayer éramos más cultos" (1946:94). But of this, more later.

E. THE TERMINOLOGY OF CULTURE CHANGE

Since World War II, anthropologists the world over have concentrated more and more on the theoretical problems raised by change and on the substantive facts of change itself. In describing the phenomena of change, a large number of terms have come into common usage, which approach the description of these phenomena from various points of view. Not only anthropologists, but sociologists, economists, political scientists, and even psychologists have concentrated their attention upon the processes of change; within this sphere of inquiry, much attention has been given to the relationship between the so-called "developed nations" and those referred to as forming part of "the third world." Terms such as "acculturation," "Westernization," "Americanization," "industrialization," "deculturation," and "modernization" are now part of the everyday descriptive repertory of the social scientist. It is not surprising that many of these terms are laden with explicit or inexplicit valuations. Thus, for instance, "Westernization" and "acculturation" may be either "good" or "bad"; whereas "deculturation" is almost always "bad." It is probably inevitable that these usages mark the value positions of observers, be they social scientists or political ideologists, and express certain underlying orientations. It is also probably inevitable that these usages maintain a continuous ambiguity of position, since there is so little common agreement on their specific meaning. Thus, in the case of Puerto Rico, what may be approvingly referred to as "modernization" by one writer, may receive equally negative imputation from another, who calls the very same changes "Americanization." It would be pretentious to attempt here to set particular meanings on such terms; but a warning, at least, is necessary. Where it is requisite to use one or another of these terms to describe a process of change in the case of Puerto Rico, every effort will be made to describe in particular the kind of change being referred to; the value implications of the terms themselves had best be left to the eye of the beholder. An examination of the particular writings referred to in subsequent sections will make clear why so pedantic a usage is necessary. Over and over again, change is referred to in terms implying that it is either "good" or "bad," without sufficient effort being invested in specifying of what, indeed, the change consists.

Anthropologists have achieved almost unanimous agreement in their view that there exists no absolute moral, ethical, or civilizational standard by which societies may be compared evaluatively. We lack any dependable scientific means which permits us to say that the culture of *x* people is morally superior to the culture of *y* people; and in fact, anthropology is still reacting to the highly charged value categorizations which typified the writing of observers of the past century. We can—given a particular philosophical orientation—claim that a society that engages in cannibalism is morally inferior to one that does not; but it remains a truly open question whether a society that engages in cannibalism is morally inferior to one that engages in war. This view—commonly known within the profession as "cultural relativism"—has little or nothing to do with the notion of technical superiority or inferiority.

It is obvious enough that the technical repertory of a particular society may indeed be significantly superior to that of some other; we have no doubt that high-powered rifles kill elephants more effectively than bows and arrows. But it is quite another matter to argue from the level of technical development to the level of ethical or moral status. If, of course, we are prepared to say that the capacity of a society to fulfill the basic needs of its citizens can be viewed as nothing more than a function of its technical level, then moral or ethical superiority can indeed be derived from technical accomplishments. But few anthropologists are ready to settle for so simple-minded a notion of cultural satisfaction.

It has to be noticed that there is nearly universal agreement in the contemporary world that technical improvement in societies which are backward in these regards is considered "morally good." The question always seems to turn on whether the price for such technical progress is worth it. Each society should face the task of deciding for itself what it must sacrifice—and whether, indeed, it is prepared to—in order to achieve a standard of life that better satisfies the basic needs of its people. The difficulty comes of course, in the failure of technical achievement to satisfy other than nonmaterial needs, and indeed, the danger that such achievement may really frustrate such needs. This particular aspect of the problem is indeed highly relevant to the Puerto Rican situation. Much of the change that Puerto Rico has experienced over the past several decades has to do with the gradual improvement of technical levels, and the resulting impact of such improvement on the style of life. Technical improvement of this sort is rarely subjected to anything like a plebiscite; it originates in changes based to a a considerable extent on developments outside the receiving society, and those who ultimately enjoy (or suffer from) the derivative benefits of such change are rarely consulted about their subjective dispositions. Since this is so, it becomes very important indeed to know which groups within a developing society regard themselves as fitted to speak valuatively concerning change and its effects.

It is also important to keep in mind that change of various sorts—and perhaps particularly change of a technical kind—can occur to some extent without reference to considerations of the political order. One of the questions which the writing of observers of the Puerto Rican scene might be expected to answer—and, on the whole, does not—has to do with the intimacy of relationship between technical change and the political setting. It is enough here simply to put the question. What can be done in providing an answer may be suggested by subsequent sections.

F. THE CULTURE CONCEPT AS A POLITICAL INSTRUMENT

In political discussions of a national culture—that of Germany, say, or of the United States—the culture is generally referred to as if it existed without reference to the particular social order which perpetuated it. And when dependent, agrarian societies of the sort variously labeled "backward," "underdeveloped," and "developing" are described this way, they are generally seen as the recipients of an overwhelming cultural pressure from their respective metropolises. The various societies of Africa, before achieving political sovereignty, were viewed as human groupings with established ways of life, overwhelmed by the pressure for change emanating from more developed centers.

In these sorts of argument, "culture" is taken to be a substantially unchanging and coherent system, which has difficulty maintaining itself in the face of outside impact. This view has much to recommend it, as a means for understanding the process of change. But it seems useful to distinguish between social change and cultural change, in making an appropriate analysis. To speak English instead of Spanish represents a significant change in culture; at the same time, however, the use of English instead of Spanish also can signify significant changes in social structure and in the interrelated system. The addition of knives and teaspoons, rather than the exclusive use of the soup spoon and fork, is also a change in culture; it, too, can mark a significant change in society. But cultural change and social change are conceptually distinct, and must be viewed as such. Otherwise, the culture is mistakenly conceived to be some kind of totally homogeneous entity characterizing a society from its topmost to its bottommost levels.

In fact, the contemporary society which lacks significant internal distinctions of a social order is a rare bird, indeed. Puerto Rico is a clearly stratified society, the behavior of whose citizens varies significantly along lines of class position and background, among other things. Many of the changes, as pointed out earlier, referred to as destructive of "Puerto Rican culture" represent in fact social changes in the position of members of the society. Other changes, it is true, represent cultural changes in a true sense. The introduction of mass media of communication, entirely foreign styles of dress, and other features originating in societies outside, do represent cultural change. But these changes do not have a uniform and undifferentiated impact on all Puerto Ricans. In fact, many of the changes deplored by those who most fiercely defend the intactness and persistence of Puerto Rican culture are experienced first by those who are the severest critics of the change itself, and only reach the mass bearers of Puerto Rican culture at a later time.

Of what, indeed, does Puerto Rican culture consist? One might justifiably include such things as a rice-and-beans diet, the speaking of Spanish, a particular kind of authority relationship between parents and children, and between husbands and wives, and many other things. But even these basic features of Puerto Rican life cannot be regarded as existing with similar force and with similar meaning throughout all strata of Puerto Rican society.

The use of the culture concept as a political instrument has been characterized, in the Puerto Rican case, by assumptions of homogeneity and uniformity for the Puerto Rican people which the realities of Puerto Rican life do not in fact support. This does not mean that there are no features of Puerto Rican culture that all Puerto

Ricans share; but it is unclear to what extent these features are the bases of Puerto Rican cultural coherence, and to what extent they merely form a residual category of the most general sort. If all (or nearly all) Puerto Ricans—regardless of age, sex, economic position, or social status—accept as right and good a firmly stratified hierarchy of social and economic classes, for instance, this could be an important unifying feature of the Puerto Rican national value system. But if all Puerto Ricans prefer to drink coffee rather than tea, this uniformity of preference is much less likely to have any serious significance for Puerto Rican national culture.

Arguments for the defense of Puerto Rican culture based on the notion of total uniformity proceed from the assumption that the basic, common features of that culture are sufficient to provide a coherence worth maintaining for its own sake. From the point of view of those more favorably disposed to change, and perhaps less involved in the issue of political status as an aspect of change, the features which differentiate segments of Puerto Rican society from each other are implicitly regarded as more important than those which typify it from top to bottom. All I mean to do here with this point is to make it clear; the implications can be weighed at a later time.

G. CULTURE AS AN HISTORICAL AGGREGATE

A culture has no existence apart from the people who "carry" it. When a society has become extinct, either by the absorption of its members into some larger society, or by the genetic termination of those who make it up, the culture which it carried dies with it. It survives only in the sense that features of culture can diffuse across societal boundaries, and so be "carried forward" by members of some other society. Thus we can say, for instance, of American society that the culture which it carries is composed of elements originating in every part of the world. There is little that can be described as exclusively and uniquely "American," "Puerto Rican," "German," etc. The particular distinctiveness of a cultural system does not rest upon the origins of the things that make it up, but upon the symbolic values attached to those things and the way they express themselves in the organization, coherence, and distinctiveness of the society itself. People who are members of a particular society give special and unique meanings to the substance of their culture, and these meanings, when we grasp them, help us to differentiate one society from another. Thus we certainly cannot claim that any culture is in any sense a "pure" product by virtue of the origins of its elements. Suttell, borrowing the insights of anthropologist Ralph Linton (1936: 325–

27), has tried to make this clear in a good-natured spoof about the "typical Puerto Rican":

> The confusion surrounding the problem of whether we should pay homage to Western culture, Puerto Rican culture, or some combination of the two, has reached scandalous proportions and all this in spite of the fact that those holding opposing viewpoints have been unable to come up with a clear definition of the crux of the argument. Some of the more extreme aspects of this controversy are reminiscent of the graphic description of the "100 per cent American" made by Ralph Linton, famous U.S. anthropologist. (Later we will adapt his ideas in order to characterize the "100 per cent Puerto Rican".)
>
> As Linton indicates: "There is probably no culture extant today which owes more than 10 per cent of its total elements to inventions made by members of its own society." This, nevertheless, should be neither the cause for lament nor alarm, but rather should serve as an incentive to creativity.
>
> Those who have contributed the least to the cultural mainstream are almost always the ones who most loudly demand the preservation of the little that they have created. A certain magnanimity of spirit is necessary in order to appreciate the worth of an unfamiliar culture, to assimilate that which has value, from whatever origin, and to use it effectively in the interests of one's own culture.
>
> The Soviet Union is an outstanding example of a people which refuses to recognize any debt to another culture. The Russians specialize in attributing all inventions, discoveries and ideas, no matter how ancient, to their own ingenuity, taking great pains to extol Russian culture while negating or ridiculing any variation.
>
> Nevertheless, if we recognize the importance of creativity, we should not be afraid to study the best to be found in other cultures. One of the great writers of the last century in the United States, Henry David Thoreau, whose writings are considered to be completely "American," owed his success among his fellow citizens to the fact that he had first steeped himself in European literature, and later rebelled against it. Those who prostrate themselves and make a fetish of regionalism and traditionalism, nearly always end up, perhaps unconsciously, opposed to everything new and/or necessary.
>
> The Daughters of the American Revolution, for example, stand out as vigorous enemies of practically everything creative and thoughtful which their ancestors stood for. The same danger exists here, that the efforts to perpetuate the adulation of regionalism may preclude the attainment of a truly Puerto Rican contribution to the literature, art, and thought of the world.
>
> In today's world we need to focus our attention more and more, not on small things, but rather on the global aspects of life and art. From the political, the cultural, the aesthetic points of view—from every point of view—we are entering an era in which we need increasingly greater understanding and appreciation of other cultures. There is no reason to believe that this inhibits local creativity—on the contrary. Those who contribute most to Puerto Rican culture from now on will be those who see Puerto Rico as a part of the world picture. Fear of contamination by Western culture will never create a Puerto Rican culture; rather, it will sterilize any attempt at cultural productivity.
>
> We will end with a description of one day in the life of a 100 per cent Puerto Rican (my apologies and thanks to Ralph Linton.)
>
> We must confess that our subject, a solid and typical Puerto Rican, arises in the morning from that artifact called a bed, a product of the Middle East

and later modified in Northern Europe, before winning the Puerto Ricans over from their traditional hammock. He throws back covers made from cotton, domesticated in India, or wool from sheep, domesticated in the Near East, or silk, the use of which was discovered in China. No matter what the material, however, the invention of spinning and weaving originated in the Middle East. It is a rare Puerto Rican who uses sanitary facilities of completely indigenous origins; the most common is a mixture of European and American inventions, both of recent date. As our friend takes off his pyjamas in his bathroom, a product of Western culture, he is shedding a garment invented in India. Later he washes with soap, thanks to the ancient Gauls. Then, unless he is a slave to nature, our Puerto Rican shaves, and this, as Linton says, is "a masochistic rite which seems to have been derived from either Sumer or ancient Egypt."

Returning to the bedroom, our hero removes his clothes from a chair which owes its design either to Southern Europe or to the Museum of Modern Art in New York. Getting dressed, it seems that the major part of his wardrobe originally came from the Asiatic steppes. His shoes, however, are of Mediterranean origin as far as design is concerned, but the leather from which they are made was tanned by a process invented in ancient Egypt. He ties a horribly colored strip of cloth around his neck which is a vestigial survival of the shoulder shawls worn by the seventeenth-century Croatians.

(Incidentally, the majority of the so-called experts on life in the tropics agree that the necktie is a monstrosity in a hot climate, from any point of view. Perhaps a truly Puerto Rican contribution to universal culture could be the complete elimination of this technicolored absurdity.)

On leaving the house, our friend buys a copy of "El Mundo", paying for it with a coin (an invention of the ancient Lydians). At the restaurant a whole new series of borrowed elements confronts him. His plate is made of a form of pottery which originally came from China. His knife is of steel, an alloy first made in Southern India, his fork a medieval Italian invention, and his spoon a derivative of a Roman original. His china originally came, not from China, but from India. And his coffee—hard as it is to admit—originated in Abyssinia. Another import! And if he adds milk and sugar to his coffee—both the domestication of cows and the idea of milking them originated in the Middle East, while sugar was first made in India.

If our Puerto Rican bolts down, among other things, his traditional plate of rice an beans at noon, perhaps he would be interested to know that beans, although known in other parts of the world since prehistoric times, were introduced relatively recently in Puerto Rico and rice is a plant indigenous only to India and Australia.

The distilling process (to which our protagonist owes his shot of rum) is mentioned by Aristotle in the fourth century B.C., and later was greatly improved by the Arabs.

Our 100 per cent Puerto Rican gets closer to home if he smokes after lunch. Smoking was a custom of the American Indians and the tobacco plant was first cultivated in Brazil. Although cigarettes were invented in Mexico, the cigar, thank goodness, was developed in the Antilles.

While smoking, our 100 percenter reads "El Mundo" imprinted in characters invented by the ancient Semites upon a material invented in China by a process invented in Germany. And as he reads about the rest of the world's problems our hero, if he is a good citizen of the Commonwealth, will thank a Hebrew deity in an Indo-European language that he is a 100 per cent Puerto Rican.

Joking aside, this sketch really packs a powerful message for the cultural nationalist. It is by no means Suttell's contention (nor was it Linton's) that societies lack distinctive characters setting their members apart from those of other, geographically separate societies. National distinctiveness must be specified, not without reference to history, but in terms unrelated to the particular historical origins of any cultural element or complex.

If we take an institution such as "compadrazgo," the system of ritual coparenthood which marks baptismal and other life-crisis ceremonies in Catholic societies, we may describe the institution in terms of its general character, and note those societies in whose cultures it occurs. But it is not the possession of a system of compadrazgo which distinguishes a society such as Puerto Rico, or Mexico, or Spain, but rather the particular meanings with which this system is invested in each case, and the societal system within which it operates. Compadrazgo is an aspect of culture, a part of the historical aggregate of Catholic societies. But it is the particular interpretation made of its character, its uses in the establishment, maintenance, and changing of societal forms, its particular significance and utility, that give it its distinctiveness in each case.

In Puerto Rico, Catholics of all classes and regions select godparents for their children on the occasion of baptism, and frequently for other life-crisis events (e.g., marriage) as well (Mintz and Wolf, 1950). So important is the institution that some lower class people acquire several sets of godparents in different ceremonies, and at least one form of compadrazgo is no more than ritualized friendship, as when two men simply seal their formal relationship by agreement, and are ever after coparents (compadres) to each other. The institution serves to tie together families in cordial and sacred ways, to give religious sponsorship to children, and to fulfill many psychological motives of the participants. Wolf (1956a) and Manners (1956) point out that a man who fears that another has designs on his wife may choose him as a compadre to forestall sexual aggressions; while Mintz (1956) demonstrates how reciprocal giving of foodstuffs, labor, and work opportunities may hinge on the compadre relationship. In proletarian communities such as Cañamelar, workers normally pick men of their own class as coparents; in stratified communities such as San José (Wolf, 1956a), poorer men seek richer ones because of the help they can give, while richer ones accept compadre obligations in order to tap the labor of their subordinates.

Thus compadrazgo as a historic Catholic institution is only made specific to Puerto Rico's case when the precise usages, attitudes, and maneuvers it permits are fully described. It is these—not the institution itself or its origin—that bring one into the sphere of a particular culture. Noticeably, the social usages themselves, and the room they allow for modification, are the important key, showing as they do the way "culture" and "society" go together.

Much the same may be said of any other aspect of culture, including language. It is not the Spanish language which gives Puerto Rico its distinctiveness nor is it merely Puerto Rico's historical affiliation with the Spanish cultural stream. But the speaking of Spanish in Puerto Rico has special characteristics and symbolic meanings, such that it may be viewed as distinctive within the Puerto Rican—as opposed to the Mexican, Spanish, or some other Hispanic—context.

Thus, I am maintaining that one cannot fruitfully describe a national culture as distinctive unless one attends to the societal forms within which the culture is endowed with its particular meanings.

In the process of the gradual assimilation of provincial culture units into larger and larger societal systems, local provincial distinctions in culture have often been eliminated or reduced. Though contemporary Spain, for example, is typified not only by distinctions of a rural-urban kind, and by truly cultural distinctions between, let us say, Vascongados and Cataluña, its history also witnessed the emergence of "national culture." This "national culture" which can be found as well in societies such as France, Great Britain, and the United States, is not, however, a single undifferentiated system in which all members of the society participate equally and in the same ways.

Puerto Rico, as much as any national unit, is marked by internal differentiation of a societal kind which reveals itself in behavioral differences. This is true even though it is correct to say that Puerto Rican culture has a distinguishable and particular character. Puerto Ricans speak Spanish; they have their own cuisine; their patterns of social relationship reveal their cultural character in such matters as styles of speech, relationships between men and women, relationships between parents and children, and in many other ways. These features, however, are not uniformly shared by all Puerto Ricans. It is perfectly reasonable to build a picture of Puerto Rican society in which the common cultural features may be regarded as differentiated according to social position in the total system, and the work of Steward's students (Steward, 1956) is substantially along these lines. Thus, for instance, the speaking of Spanish is not uniform throughout the society; upperclass Puerto Ricans and lowerclass Puerto Ricans both speak Spanish, but it is a different Spanish in each case, and Puerto Ricans themselves are perfectly aware of the difference. To a large extent, it may be said that all Puerto Ricans drink coffee—but the coffee of the upperclass Puerto Rican is not the coffee of the lowerclass

Puerto Rican, and once again, members of these different classes are perfectly aware of the difference. Much the same may be said of every feature which is regarded as distinctively Puerto Rican.

Since much of this analysis has significant implications for the dialogue concerning political status, it should be said once again that these points are not being advanced with reference to one or another such political position. The point here is not to derive a political answer from the cultural and societal facts, but to make clear that these facts must be handled analytically, rather than emotionally, if any clarity at all is to be achieved with regard to Puerto Rican identity. It is simply not enough, as one writer (Maldonado Denis, 1963: 141) has suggested, to define culture as "the total form of life of a people." Indeed, culture is the total form of life of a people; but so defined, we come no closer to an analytic understanding of what culture is or how it may best be changed or preserved.

The discussions of culture and of identity, then, which have marked the Puerto Rican scene, probably would benefit from some sharpening of concepts. And when the significance of the culture is made to hinge on the meanings of the past, care in the use of concepts is especially important. Culture is a result of what has gone before, a historical product; even when culture change is rapid and intense, much that is cultural will persist with great strength. And those who mean to dignify and enhance Puerto Rican identity refer to the past as the keel of that identity. Thus, for instance, Vientos Gastón (1964: 37): "* * * the past is the sum of the accumulated experience of previous generations: history. The present lacks sense when there is no consciousness of the past." But whose past are we speaking of? The question is answered very differently, according to whether one asks a university professor or a sugar cane worker in the countryside. And which past? It matters whether one sees oneself, for example, as the end-product of Spanish hidalguia, Island-Arawak subjugation, or African enslavement. To today's 50-year-old cane cutter, "the past" signifies the awful thirties, now fading; to today's 80-year-old ex-cane cutter, "the past" means the Guardia Civil, Los Compontes, and the tragedy of Spanish rule; to the 20-year-old of today, "the past" is again a different one. "The past" is a very long time indeed; and different people conceive of it differently. It is hard to escape here the feeling that the real job of those who would observe an interpret Puerto Rican life and identity is to find out what the people—all the people—really believe and want. It may well turn out that those who most glory in the past are spared the necessity of living it; while those who must live it are indeed most disposed to change.

Collingwood has written of "encapsulated history," the historical consciousness of a people. It seems that some societies live their historical experience more richly than others and this may express, more than anything else, the national identity. But historical consciousness is not a thing or substance to be pumped artificially into those who lack it, and the historical sense of many Puerto Ricans is taken up more with island history since 1940 than with the longer and grander trajectory of centuries. I believe this to be far more than a mere assertion; it may, in fact, be an unpalatable truth for some.

PART II. PUERTO RICO IN THE CARIBBEAN SETTING

Puerto Rico was one of Spain's first colonies in the New World, and shared in the colonial experience during the initial period of Spain's imperial experimentation with the rule and administration of subject peoples overseas. Three important features of the later economic and societal development of the Antilles appeared very early here: the sugar cane, the employment of African slaves, and that particular form of agro-social organization referred to here as the plantation. Furthermore, it is within the Caribbean area that political dependence, European control, and the colonial ambiance have endured most uninterruptedly in New World history. Though considerable local variation qualifies a description this general, some attempt is made in the following presentation to define Puerto Rico's particularity.

Within the Caribbean sphere, it is worth remarking that Spain gave up no ground to its European rivals until the beginnings of the seventeenth century. In effect, this meant that colonization and administration within the islands were monopolized by Spain for about the first 125 years of its history as an imperial system. During the first 20 years of the Conquest, Spain established and consolidated its control in the Greater Antilles. The Lesser Antilles were ignored, partly because they had no mineral resources, partly because the Island-Carib peoples of these islands showed effective and unremitting resistance to the Spaniards. Within the larger islands, however, and on significant portions of the mainland coast, Spanish imperium was indeed established and fortified. In these larger islands, which included Puerto Rico, the early concerns of the colonizers were subjugation, the establishment of economic enterprise (especially mining, based, for the most part, on enslaved or enforced native labor), and proselytization. Though early development lagged, the Spaniards were able to establish substantial island colonies of overseas settlers.

Beginning with the discovery and conquest of the mainland in 1519, however, Spanish interest in the islands lagged; those who had colonized the Antilles did not wish to stay, and those migrants who were coming to the New World preferred to establish themselves on the mainland, where opportunities for the acquisition of wealth were greater. One of the most significant features of the Hispanic Caribbean, then, was the extent to which it became an isolated overseas area within a few short decades of the original conquest.

Beginning early in the seventeenth century, Spain's rivals began to establish successful small-scale settlements within the Lesser Antilles. Then, in 1655, Jamaica fell to Great Britain, and in 1697, the western third of the island of Hispaniola was ceded by treaty to the French. Thus it was that, from the early 17th century onward, Spain's possessions in the Caribbean area, which she had effectively controlled for more than a century, began to pass into enemy hands. After 1697, Spain was left with Cuba, Santo Domingo (eastern Hispaniola), and Puerto Rico within the Caribbean sphere.

The history of these Hispanic colonies was sufficiently different from those of other powers that they may be regarded as a distinctive subarea within the islands. That distinctiveness, however, must be set against the underlying uniformities which characterized the settlement and development of the Caribbean as a whole, as the first sphere of Western European overseas colonialism.

Before dealing with Puerto Rico itself, there are good reasons for attempting to see the Caribbean first as part of some larger region. That region, which marked the lowland areas of the New World extending from the United States south to northeast Brazil, and including the Caribbean islands as well as much of the circum-Caribbean coasts, shared in a pattern of economic organization of enormous proportions and very lengthy duration, to which Curtin (1955: 4) has referred as "the South Atlantic system." This system, in brief, was based on the development of plantation agriculture as an emergent phase in European expansion. Its operation involved the employment of various types of forced, contract, and slave labor as a major means for relating the labor force productively to the land. The principal source of post-Conquest labor was Africa. Expectably, therefore, cultural continuities within this grand area show a substantial (though by no means exclusive) African component. It further follows that this is an area within which political dependence on overseas power was both protracted and persistent.

The fact is, however, that the Hispanic Caribbean colonies shared most actively in this general characterization only at the beginning and at the end of the plantation saga. It would be quite mistaken to suppose that the participation of Spain's Caribbean colonies in the plantation experience, though limited and uneven, did not significantly affect their contemporary character. Nevertheless, it would be equally mistaken to suppose that, because these colonies had sugarcane plantations and African slaves, their essential character was so much like that of the British, French, and Dutch colonies as to have no distinctive features of their own. Thus, for instance, it is inappropriate to refer to the Hispanic islands as an undifferentiated portion of what anthropologists have called "Afro-America." The Puerto Rican population of African origin, while ancient—the first African slaves were apparently introduced in 1510—has never bulked largely, and has always been outnumbered by people of different antecedents. The picture contrasts sharply with that in Jamaica after 1655, Saint-Domingue after 1697, or other "classic" slave-plantation islands, where massive importations of enslaved Africans were controlled by tiny minorities of Caucasian masters, few of them permanent settlers, and where this background powerfully affects the modern sociology of these societies. This is why Professor Barbosa Muñiz is justified in questioning (1964: 6–7) Lewis' assertion that Puerto Rico is "by historical fiat (part of) the West Indies." Indeed, Puerto Rico is part of the West Indies; but it is by no means a part as is, let us say, Jamaica or Haiti. In fact, the Hispanic Caribbean, while it shared certain basic historical features with that wider area of which it is a part, must also be viewed as different, according to its special historical experience. For instance, though slave-based plantations flourished early in the Hispanic islands, they also withered there at the very time when slave-plantation expansion in the Caribbean possessions of other European powers was most rapid (Mintz, 1951a, 1959, 1961a).

Furthermore, the demography of such development in the non-Hispanic islands was quite different. The populational character of the Hispanic Caribbean was much more significantly European than was true for the British, Dutch, and French islands within the area, and this difference is still apparent, and culturally significant. Other aspects of the demographic experience also set Puerto Rico and the rest of the Hispanic Caribbean somewhat apart in ethnic or cultural terms. Of the three Hispanic colonies, only Cuba underwent the experience of receiving substantial numbers of migrants differing both in culture and in national origin from its own population at the time, and then, both late and in somewhat distinctive form. In these and other ways, it must be maintained that the Hispanic Caribbean both is, and is not, similar to that of other island neighbors.

But Dr. Lewis is correct in his assertion (1963: passim) that the fundamental historical trajectory of the Caribbean as an area characterized all of the islands, and much of their neighboring mainland coast. The problem, as always, is one of separating out similarities and differences in some analytically incisive fashion.

The "Hispanic Caribbean" consists in effect of three units: The Republic of Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Puerto Rico. The term "Hispanic" is appropriate for several reasons. The populations of these three areas are Spanish-speaking, and all three units were originally colonized by the Spaniards, remaining Spanish possessions politically until the 19th century, and substantially Hispanic in culture until the present. The peoples of all three, though to a varying degree, regard themselves as carriers of the Hispanic heritage. The Dominican Republic achieved its final political independence in 1865, after a previous period of subjection to the rule of the Republic of Haiti, and a brief reassertion of Spanish rule. Cuba remained a Spanish possession, as did Puerto Rico, until the start of this century. The historical careers of these three societies prior to 1900 were by no means uniform. But they shared significantly a common colonial experience, by virtue of Spain's metropolitan ambitions in the New World.

As has been pointed out, after the discovery of the wealth in men and metallic resources on the mainland of Middle and South America, Spanish interest in her Caribbean colonies waned. As early as 1520, newcomers to the islands and their already-established populations were more interested in finding a new life on the mainland than in maintaining the strength and development of the islands themselves. The conquest of the Aztecs, and of the Inca Empire several decades later, led to a gradual depopulation of the Hispanic Caribbean, and to a significant change in its place in the Spanish imperium; Cuba, Hispaniola and Puerto Rico were to become fueling stations and bastions along the routes of the treasure fleets, while Spanish ports on the Central American mainland—such as Cartagena and Puerto Bello—were soon to replace Havana and Puerto Rico (that is, San Juan) as entrepots of New World Spanish trade.

Thus, until the closing decades of the 18th century, the Hispanic Caribbean was to undergo a period of lengthy and almost complete isolation, while its peoples took on a distinctive Creole culture of their own. Only after about 1775 did these Spanish colonies begin to grow economically once more; in so doing, they were to repeat in many ways the colonial experiences of the Dutch, British, and French Antillean colonies which were their neighbors. At the start of this century the particular colonial histories of the Spanish colonies would diverge anew. American interest in Puerto Rico and in Cuba was much more intense than in the Dominican Republic (then Santo Domingo). Having achieved its sovereignty in 1865, Santo Domingo would remain in many ways the most authentically "Hispanic" of these three islands. Moreover, it was to remain to a large extent the most isolated of the three—thereby continuing the "social remoteness" that had been imposed on the islands as early as the opening decades of the 16th century.

The political history of these three societies has differed significantly. Santo Domingo remained a nominally sovereign country, Cuba was to achieve an equally nominal sovereignty, and Puerto Rico was to be a U.S. dependency. The cultural consequences of these distinctions are also significant; although no serious attempt will be made to spell them out in any detail here, it is correct to say that these societies are more similar culturally than sociologically.

Whether one speaks of the Spanish language, the basic rice-and-beans diet, the significance of Spanish folk Catholicism, or some other feature of the cultural scene—coffee-drinking, compadrazgo, or cockfighting—these islands find their commonality in their cultural past, rather than in their societal or political organization. In one sense, of course, social forms are themselves part of the culture. Such an institution as compadrazgo, particular forms of courtship, and other aspects of the cultural system which are themselves linkages or articulations between cultural content and standard patterns of human relationship are simultaneously social and cultural. But it has already been pointed out that each society employs its cultural materials in sociologically and symbolically distinctive ways. Thus, for instance, while the system of compadrazgo will show certain gross uniformities, whether in Santo Domingo, Cuba, or Puerto Rico, the different societal segments of these societies use the institution in particular and different ways. Furthermore, while the populations of these three societies may regard themselves as sharing some common cultural base, they do not regard themselves as members of some single "Hispanic society," however much such a view may be espoused. Puerto Ricans do not regard themselves as sharing a common identity with Cubans, and Cubans would reject such a notion violently; Santo Domingans (or Dominicans) also view themselves as societally distinct from both Cubans and Puerto Ricans. On certain political grounds, it has been fashionable to think of these societies as forming a single segment of an articulated Hispanic past (as expressed symbolically, for instance, in Rafael Hernández' popular song, "Las Tres Hermanitas"). Anyone willing to face social and political reality, however, should be prepared to acknowledge that these three societies share only features, and that these features do not make for membership within a single human grouping on societal grounds. Cubans often manifest a poorly-concealed condescension for their Puerto Rican neighbors, and members of both societies appear to regard Santo Domingo as the most backward and "hickish" of the three. Cuba, by virtue of her size, population, and lengthy political sovereignty, surely sees itself as pre-eminent among the Hispanic Caribbean societies, and this is the way Cuba is seen by her Hispanic island neighbors. The relationship between Cuban and Puerto Rican migrants to New York—even before the coming to power of the Castro regime—make clear that the societies, while they may share much within their cultural past, view themselves differently, and both Puerto Ricans and Cubans seem prepared to agree that Cuba is the stronger and more "intact" society. In contrast to these two states, Santo Domingo enjoys a lengthier history of political sovereignty, but a more backward and isolated past. In short, while these three societies do, indeed, share much, they remain significantly different, not only in the details of their pasts, but also in the consciousness of their peoples.

The contrasts among these three societies already referred to have not dealt with those features of Puerto Rican society which set it apart from those of Santo Domingo and Cuba, but rather with those held in common. Puerto Rico and Cuba both remained Spanish colonies until 1899. Both entered into a period of plantation growth in the late 18th and early 19th centuries; both (though Puerto Rico to a much lesser extent) underwent demographic expansion through the introduction of additional slaves in the early 19th century. Finally, both fell within the sphere of expanding U.S. power at the start of this century, and each society regards itself as more advanced than its third, Hispanic neighbor. There may be some special quality to Puerto Rico's consciousness of identity, insofar as its history lacks little demonstration of a political push toward independence at all as powerful as the disturbances which long marked Cuba's career as a colonial dependency of Spain. Cuba is larger, richer, and more populous than Puerto Rico. Its leading intellectual figures have had greater access to the international scene, and have won wider recognition, on the whole. Moreover, the particular political and economic relationships which have linked each of these societies to the United States during the 20th century have differed in significant regards. Puerto Rico's ambivalence—cultural, political, and intellectual—has certain qualities which seem to distinguish it from Cuba. It will be the purpose of subsequent sections to delineate this distinctiveness in greater detail.

Part III. Some Views of Puerto Rican Culture

One of the earliest and most eloquent attempts to identify the distinctively Puerto Rican quality of island life is Antonio S. Pedreira's classic little book of essays, "Insularismo" (1946).[2] A survey of the observations of social scientists and humanists on the problem of Puerto Rican identity can begin no more effectively than with Pedreira's gracious and honest reflections. Since its original publication, this work has become increasingly significant in the ideological dialogue, a fact that requires comment; and Pedreira's perspective itself is of great interest. As an outsider, and one too unfamiliar with the island's intellectual life to speak with assurance, the writer cannot claim that his reactions to Pedreira are in the least sense definitive; but I must take my chances.

Pedreira urges his Puerto Rican readers to be self-critical, rather than merely critical—to repudiate "that optimistic and sterile interpretation of history from which flows the arrogant belief that we are the *non plus ultra* of Caribbean peoples" (1946: 10). He insists that Puerto Rico long had been, and remains, an Hispanic colony, albeit one that had created some quality of separateness and distinctiveness within the Latin American sphere (1946: 14). In somewhat mystical and racial terms, he suggests an ambivalence or incertitude of character, originating in the divided racial ancestry of the Puerto Rican people (1946: 22–29); almost in the same breath, however, he idealizes the highlander or jíbaro, whose robustness, humorous distrust, hospitality, and high spirits ostensibly lend special flavor to the Puerto Rican identity (1946: 24–25). Pedreira tries hard to balance those characteristics of the Puerto Rican people which he regards as affirmative against those that limit growth and free expression. On the negative side, Puerto Ricans are docile—unlike, for instance, their Cuban neighbors (1946: 33)—rather too cautious, too peaceful, too resigned. They are insular and, so, insulated (1946: 45); these characteristics may be part of the disadvantages of being islanders, and inhabitants of a small and benign island at that.

Pedreira's view of Puerto Rico and the Puerto Ricans was in many regards a very contemporary view, a view of island life as he saw it in 1934. He adverts repeatedly to the powerful influences from abroad than change and even undermine traditional Puerto Rican ways, and he makes frequent reference to the culturally destructive effects of large-scale plantation expansion (1946: 47, 93, 124, etc.). In view of this, it is interesting to have him assert at the same time that economically beneficial culture change may justifiably supplant traditions that persist either for their own sake, or simply because no alternatives are available. Thus, as one minor example, the beloved hut or "bohío" of the countryside has no justification for survival if its inhabitants have the means to build houses both more stable and more comfortable in their place (p. 48). The author's view is balanced throughout. Rapid change, the loss of old ways, the emphasis on the mass product (both material and human) characteristic of North American society, disturb and sadden him. But he seems to be saying that all of this can be tolerated, if only the Puerto Rican will struggle to see what he is, and what he can be, and if only the educational system that shapes him can be made to produce individuals, and not "mediocrats" (1946: 116–117, 193 et seq.).

"Insularismo" is not what would ordinarily be called social science in North America. It is, rather, an aesthetically pleasing and insightful attempt to probe the origins and identify the features of the Puerto Rican character, and many of its assertions seem both just and valid. If one were to seek some special theme in this book, it would probably be Pedreira's concern that Puerto Rican identity was in danger of being snuffed out, almost before it had begun to take shape. He argues that the Puerto Rican people, though docile and often resigned, had at last begun to form themselves into a nation after centuries of isolation and insulation, only to be caught up in a new dependency, both material and spiritual, upon the United States. In this basic sense, Pedreira's view carries a political message. But several other observations may be useful. First, Pedreira wrote "Insularismo" at a time when the North American economic impact on Puerto Rico was most acute, and when the world economic depression was at its worse. The 1930's saw a maturation of the sugar-plantation economy, deeply disturbing in its effects upon Puerto Rican culture. A continued decline of the coffee industry which, as the most important economic pursuit of the highlands, significantly nourished the stereotyped cultural core of Puerto Rican identity. Political difficulties resulting from North American neglect, exploitation, and ignorance were matched by a parallel growth of cynical resignation and angry nationalism. In a much-quoted article Luis Muñoz Marín had written in the 1920's, the perspective of Pedreira's analysis is, perhaps surprisingly, suggested:

> Two forces appeared dramatically to precipitate a change that would perhaps have taken place anyway: a cyclone and the Americans. The cyclone of San Ciriaco wrought havoc with the coffee and tobacco plantations of the mountains, ruining a host of small landowners and centralizing the soil into fewer and mightier hands. The Americans came in the name of liberty and democracy and destroyed the liberal parliamentary government wrested from Spain by Luis Muñoz Rivera two months before the outbreak of the war; they also brought the tariff on sugar, which attracted outside and local capital to the cane-fields of the coast. Twenty-three years ago there were scattered over the island several hundred primitive sugar mills which turned out around 69,000 tons annually. In 1920 there were seventy-five modern factories, belonging for the most part to large absentee corporations, turning out six times that number of tons. That is the open glory of the colonialists. Profit has been known to surpass 100 per cent per annum, and a very large share of it leaves the island never to return. That is the secret glory of the colonialists. And even this ghastly spectacle of wealth drained from a starving population into the richest country on earth is sanctimoniously set down in the official reports as a 'favorable trade balance.'
>
> As a young editor put it to the House Committee on Insular Affairs, one of our sorest economic troubles is that we have no bananas today. We used to have a lot of them; they grew all around and could usually be had for the picking, so that they made a very important item in the common diet. And what was true

> of bananas was true of many fruits and vegetables. But sugarcane is elbowing all of these out of the soil. Now we import our staples, with the result, as Dr. Bailey K. Ashford sees it, that not even the rich are well nourished in Porto Rico.
>
> The tobacco industry is entirely under the tutelage of the American tobacco trust, and coffee-growing, the last refuge of the falling middle class, suffers from the fact that to the great coffee-drinking people of the United States, all coffees taste alike! The consequences of all this have been the attainment of certain sections of a half dozen towns to a degree of opulence seldom tasteful enough to be a public good; the proletarization of great masses of people; the debasing of a general standard of living, that was never too generous; the elimination of certain ethical checks and cultural ideals that became untenable in sweated colonies and on rafts lost at sea" (1924: 384–386).

In these brief paragraphs, Muñoz suggests well the economic and acculturational perspective from which Pedreira tries to "explan" Puerto Rico. Given the times, there is nothing but honesty in what these men have written.

One cannot know, however, what Pedreira would think of his Puerto Rico today, and this raises another, rather curious, question. Thirty-one years have passed since Pedreira wrote, and they have been years of great change for the island. It is interesting, then, that hardly anyone has apparently been moved to rethink or to reevaluate his theses, especially since the book continues to be almost Biblical in its importance to many contemporary thinkers. This, too, may be a comment on "Puertorriqueñidad," though it may be considered invidious to suggest it.

What has distinguished Pedreira's work, aside from its service as an ideological guidepost to many contemporaries, is its concern with what may be called "national character." This thorny concept has bedevilled social scientists because of its vagueness and unspecifiability; even while reading Pedreira, one is tormented by the simultaneous feelings that much of what he says is true—but entirely unprovable. A few other writers have attempted to talk about "the Puerto Rican" or the "average" Puerto Rican; one may applaud their efforts without any thoroughgoing conviction about their generalizations. Petrullo, for instance, an anthropologist, has written (1947) a general analysis of Puerto Rico distinguished for its sympathetic understanding of the people, but drawing few distinctions among different social and economic groupings in insular society. He stresses appropriately the concern with a style of life, the humanism, the preoccupation with dignity in the best sense—but deals too little with the ways these values are symbolically differentiated among different subcultures. His assertion that Puerto Ricans disdain work (1947: 30–40, 102) because of the Spanish ideal of "hidalguía" and of the opportunities in previous centuries to eke out an indolent existence in the highlands, simply does not accord with the strongly-expressed rural feeling that vigorous labor is a symbol of male virility. Much the same criticism may be made of others who have grappled with the question of what is essentially Puerto Rican. In a truly poor article, Reuter (1946) enumerates supposedly Puerto Rican characteristics in a lengthy and pejorative list that could not possibly pass as more than impressionism, and of a ludicrously ethnocentric brand at that; Puerto Ricans are traditionalistic, adolescent in their emotional attitudes, fantasy ridden, nonrelativistic, and much else—all of it bad:

> The contrasted attitudes toward life which have been pointed out by both continental and Island commentators show that the American is realistic, concise, exact, irreverent, competent, prompt and dependable; the Puerto Rican tends to be romantic, diffuse, vague, superstitious, inefficient, dilatory and unreliable. Where the American is modern, the Puerto Rican is medieval; where the American is scientific, the Puerto Rican is poetic. Where modern life and industry demand accuracy, the Puerto Rican is casual and careless; where science demands verification, the Puerto Rican guesses and improvises. The American is interested in results, the Puerto Rican is interested in poetry; the American wants facts, the Puerto Rican prefers oratory; the American reads, the Puerto Rican talks. The American is impatient with the casual attitudes of the Puerto Rican; the Puerto Rican is irritated by the exacting demands of the American (1946: 96).

More useful, and much more serious, is Saavedra de Roca's attempt to formulate a schema for the examination of the traits attributed to Puerto Rican character (1963). Her paper seeks no judgment of the realities of that character, but summarizes instead some of the significant assertions other social scientists have made with regard to the Puerto Ricans. The paper treats of such traits as dignity, individuality, personalism, family values, "machismo," and so on. Again, of course, the difficulty lies in attempting either to specify for which groups in the society the particular values hold, or to find means of confirming or disapproving the assertions themselves.

In an important paper, René Marqués (1963) elaborates a general theme originating in Pedreira's "Insularismo"—Puerto Rican "docility." His analysis is intense, assertive, provocative, but again hardly provable. Puerto Ricans are suicidal, suffer from feelings of inferiority, have authoritarian personalities. As women gain economic and social equality, men retreat from their traditional machismo and become yet more docile. The English language cows and bewilders Puerto Ricans; its acceptance is additional evidence of Puerto Rican docility. Even the Partido Independentista is docile, for it passively awaits a future it cannot produce. Marqués is pessimistic and confirmed in his beliefs by his own findings. Much of his argument hinges on the theme of a dependency relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico, and he opens new vistas to understanding this dependency. But as with others, Puerto Rico for him is an integer, and its national character some sort of undifferentiated composite of life-styles and attitudes.

More ambitious attempts to characterize the totality of Puerto Rico in cultural terms have been made by Brameld (1959); by Saavedra de Roca (1963) and Figueroa Mercado (1963), using the published works of others; and by Seda Bonilla (1957, 1964). Child-training and socialization materials, as used by Wolf (1952), Landy (1959), and Steward's associates (Steward, 1956), lend themselves to wider generalization about Puerto Rican "culture and personality." Scholars including Lauria (1964) and Seda Bonilla (1957) have sought generalization in the ideal patterns of behavior that are meant to guide Puerto Ricans in their social interaction. These various approaches, when added to those described earlier, offer a rich body of materials to the interested reader. But any summary statement of Puerto Rican character or identity, and any attempt to describe Puerto Ricans as if their culture were homogeneous, means treading on risky ground. Among the value statements that find support in the literature are the following: the near-universal use of Spanish, and its attached sentimental significance; the meaning of Puerto Rico's distinctive character as "a Catholic country"; the underlying acceptance of a stratified society, with behavioral accompaniments attuned to near-automatic deference on the one hand, and the unchallenged exercise of authority on the other; the belief in the integrity of the individual as based upon an inner worth, unrelated to worldly status or accomplishment; a humanistic view of the world, with social values put above scientific values; a double sexual standard, with a very strong emphasis on female chastity and a belief in the natural inferiority of women; a much-elaborated set of values dealing with maleness and male authority (machismo); a reliance on shame, rather than guilt, as a source of social control, and a dependence on the opinions of others in forming and maintaining one's opinion of oneself, accompanied by a strong gregariousness and dislike of solitude and of loneliness; and a dependence on others, expressed in docility, the inability to make difficult decisions, and the unwillingness to handle problems by directly confronting them.[3]

Different in approach and perhaps somewhat more amenable to validation, are those studies which limit their findings to members of one social group, class, or subculture, or differentiate their generalizations according to differences of these sorts. The fact is that Puerto Rico has never been an entirely homogeneous society in terms of physical type, ethnic identity, or social and economic position; from its beginnings as a New World colony of Spain, the island has always had a stratified and heterogeneous social structure. While it is perfectly tenable to posit and try to identify certain values, strains of temperament, attitudes, and beliefs considered "typical" of such a society, something more may be gained by accepting the relevance of social, economic, and other distinctions to any aggregate picture of Puerto Rico. Probably the most ambitious such exercise is embodied in the work of Julian Steward and his associates (1956), but before discussing that project, several other lines of research should be mentioned. These have to do with two significant social distinctions in Puerto Rican life—distinctions that can serve as axes, so to speak, for the analysis of the wider society: race and race relations, and subcultural differences related to differences in class.

The study of race in Puerto Rico has been little advanced by social scientists. While Lewis overstates the case when he writes that, so far as the study of race and race relations are concerned, "* * * the conspiracy of silence on the part of most Puerto Ricans has been respected by the American analyst" (1963: 263), it is true that little disciplined investigation of the subject has been undertaken. Several of the most telling studies have been the pioneer analyses by Rosario and Carrión (1940) and by Blanco (1942). Largely historical in their emphases, these works have done much to set the question of color as a social issue into a wider context. Slavery in Puerto Rico, though it began very early and lasted very late, was not, on the whole, severe or economically crucial. In spite of several periods when the Negro people, both slave and free, suffered from special disadvantages imposed by repressive colonial governments, the history of the "races" of Puerto Rico has been one of gradual and relatively unburdensome assimilation. There is no need to gild the lily; slavery in the Hispanic colonies could be—and often was—as vicious as it was anywhere (Mintz, 1961b). But never did race prejudice in Puerto Rico take on the unadornedly dehumanizing quality characteristic of such areas as the United States South. An uneven economic history, a relatively weak plantation development, the presence of a universalistic religion almost as available to slaves as it was to freemen, the functioning of protective laws, and the political importance of the Creole-Spaniard distinction—all worked to ease the harshness of Puerto Rican slavery and to make manumission both accessible and frequent.

This is by no means to say that race prejudice of some kind is unknown to Puerto Rico. But such prejudice has a particular character, best understood, it seems, by reference to economic history, the relative unimportance of slavery, the nature of Hispanic colonial rule, and the presence of a single official and universal religion. Social status, not color, was the axis along which prejudice revealed itself, and this is still true to a considerable extent, although solid contemporary research on race and race relations is disappointingly sparse.

The status of the slave was clearly marked out in Spanish legal and moral philosophy long before the discovery of the New World (cf., for instance, Tannenbaum, 1947; Mellafe, 1964). In spite of a most serious and important dialog concerning the social status of the enslavable and the enslaved, which gripped Spanish thinkers for centuries (Hanke, 1949; Zavala, 1964), Hispanic colonial policy in the new colonies of the Caribbean early sustained the economic and social relevance of slavery to development. The first Negro slaves reached Hispaniola by 1510, and enslaved Africans were imported into Cuba nearly until the eve of abolition (1880), and into Puerto Rico—where slavery ended in 1873—almost as long. Díaz Soler has written definitively of the history of Negro slavery in Puerto Rico (1953), and there is no need to review his presentation here. Suffice it to say that slavery in Puerto Rico was rarely characterized by deliberate viciousness; manumission was, for most of the epoch, relatively easy; the Catholic faith was usually available to the slaves, as was the creation of relatively stable family organization; and intermarriage of persons of differing physical appearance was common. By the second decade of the 19th century, Puerto Rico had a very substantial population of freemen of "mixed" ancestry, and at no time did the number of slaves exceed that of free people. During the period of rapid plantation growth—particularly after 1815—repressive legislation became more common, revolts occurred with greater frequency, and Negro people of all statuses were degraded by the expanding plantation system (Mintz, 1951b, 1959, 1961b). But this degradation was accompanied by a parallel decline in the civil rights of the landless free creoles of all complexions, and by the implementation of repressive labor laws that disadvantaged black and white alike. The struggle for Negro rights in Puerto Rico was almost always a struggle for the civil rights of all of the poor and landless, and little happened to give the Negro people a truly separate social identity. Any discussion of contemporary race relations must proceed from this historical background.

The almost continuous genetic intermixing of the Puerto Rican people produced several effects upon race relations similar to much of the rest of Latin America. For instance, racial terminology is often euphemistic and implicit—the commonest term for "Negro", trigueño, literally means "wheat-colored." "Negrito" is a term of affection; the word "negro" is rarely used, almost never in address, and is affective rather than descriptive. Sereno, a psychiatrist, has even contended (1947) that the liberalism of Puerto Rican race attitudes is conditioned by the secret fear that every Puerto Rican's ancestry may be at least minimally African, asserting at the same time that "race fear" results in social discrimination. Another aspect of race relations in Puerto Rico is the lack of any powerful barrier or conceptual boundary separating "Negroes" from "whites." As in most of Latin America, race distinctions are viewed along some sort of multidimensional continuum—one is not "white" or "Negro" so much as differentially placed along a series of imperceptibly changing gradients. This is not to say that there are no "types"—terms such as "pardo, moreno, triste de color, indio, grifo, jabao" are still much used—but such type-terms do not seem to be attached to distinguishable social groups within the society. While lack of adequate scientific research on these matters is a serious obstacle to evaluation, it is clear that Puerto Rico is not divided into "white" and "black."

At the same time that Puerto Rican race prejudice fails to show itself in more familiar (e.g., North American) ways, such prejudice does indeed exist. It is rooted in the historical reality of slavery in Puerto Rico. On the whole, enslaved Africans were confined to the island's coastal areas, where sugarcane production was economically important. Significant concentrations of persons of prevailingly negroid phenotype are still present in such municipalities as Arroyo and Loiza (more than 50 percent), Salinas and Carolina (more than 40 percent), and Guayama and Humacoa (more than 30 percent) (Alvárez Nazario, 1961: 101–102). Admitting the relative inexactness of such calculations, it is clear that the Negro people of today are still concentrated in the areas of important plantation production in the 19th century. It follows that the majority of the people of this phenotype are members of the poorer segments of Puerto Rican society, and accordingly, of those segments with less education. Thus stated, the relationship between being Negro and being subjected to social prejudice becomes a little clearer. Rogler (1948) is probably correct in suggesting that the relatively static mobility situation for lower class persons during most of Puerto Rico's history militated against the creation of any individious distinctions based on physical type alone. Yet the same author does not suggest that race prejudice is absent on the island and, in fact, renders an important service by stressing its differential importance in different social groups.

Social prejudice of an obvious sort shows itself in some segments of the upper classes, where its baldly racial basis is firm:

> A person who has marked Negro physical characteristics and is therefore described as a Negro may have high income, great political power, and advanced education, yet on racial grounds may be excluded from the inner circles of intimate family life, Greek letter sorority or fraternity membership, and the more select social clubs. He may attend political affairs, be a guest at the governor's

> palace, and be invited to political cocktail parties, because people wish to cultivate his friendship, but he probably would not be asked to a girl's engagement party or other private functions (Steward, 1956: 424–425).

For lower class people, while race "consciousness" is indeed high, race prejudice—as North Americans conceive of it—is rare or absent.

Thus, while race consciousness and certain sorts of race prejudice do indeed function importantly in Puerto Rican social relations, these restrictive attitudes apparently do not provide a major basis for dividing up the Puerto Rican people socially. Much more important, it seems, are those distinctions which might be drawn with reference to socioeconomic position, or rather, to class.

The most ambitious social science attempt to deal with Puerto Rican society differentially—that is, in terms of distinct sociocultural segments, and their behaviors and subcultures—is embodied in the work of Julian Steward and his students, "The People of Puerto Rico" (1956). Quite unamenable to summary, this book was an attempt to produce a holistic picture of Puerto Rico by synthesizing the findings of a series of simultaneously executed community studies, each purportedly of a community roughly representative of a large segment of the Puerto Rican people. In addition, culture-historical sections and a study of the insular elite are included.

The book was, for its authors, a test of method, as well as an essay in the delineation of a national culture. Probably more persons read it for its theoretical intent than for what it had to say about Puerto Rico. Whatever one may think of this study, it did provide the first multicommunity account of the daily lives of Puerto Ricans and a wealth of information on their cultures, and it puts heavy emphasis on the societal linkages between and among groups in trying to sketch in the basis for Puerto Rican homogeneity or unity.

The analysis of the social-class structure of Puerto Rican undertaken by Steward and his students was based on the results of field findings in the communities studied; as a result, the building-blocks, so to speak, in the national class structure were observable groupings in particular settings. The authors understood that they could generalize such local findings in only a limited fashion to the national picture. In certain instances, however, the generalizability of the local findings seemed somewhat greater than in others. For instance, the grouping labeled "rural proletariat" (Mintz, 1951, 1953a, 1953b, 1956) might be regarded safely as a "national sociocultural segment," to use Steward's terminology:

> The imposition of the sugar plantation system on the south coast of Puerto Rico effected the emergence of large numbers of rural proletarian communities. In these communities the vast majority of people is landless, propertyless (in the sense of *productive* property), wage-earning, store-buying * * *, corporately

> employed, and standing in like relationship to the main source of employment. * * * The working people not only stand in like relationship to the productive apparatus but are also interacting in reciprocal social relationships with each other and subordinate social relationships to members of higher classes. * * * The commonality of class identity, stabilized over a fifty-year period, and built upon a history of pre-occupation sugar haciendas in the region, makes for a kind of cultural homogeneity. House types are limited in variety and reveal many common features. Food preferences are clear cut and strikingly uniform. * * * Similarities in life-ways among these rural working people extend to child-training practices, ritual kinship practices (not merely the Catholic system of *compadrazgo* but the particular ways in which this system is employed and standardized), political attitudes, attitudes toward the land, attitudes toward the position of women, similarities of dress, and other expressions of taste, religion, and so on (Mintz, 1935b : 140).

In other words, those Puerto Ricans who may be accurately classed as "rural proletarians" probably share considerable uniformity of behavior and of culture. They are neither "typical" Puerto Ricans, nor "average" Puerto Ricans; what may be said generally of them need not hold for the Puerto Rican people as a whole. But they do from one sort of delimitable group within the totality of Puerto Rico, and a numerically significant one.

Hopefully, the utility of a category such as "rural proletarian," when compared to the more popular but much less specific and identifiable "jíbaro," is demonstrable. As Wolf (1956a:203) points out, jíbaro is a term defined from the vantage point of the speaker; anyone more rural or "hickish" than the speaker is "un jíbaro." City people call villagers jíbaros; villagers call those more rural than themselves jíbaros; coastal people call highland people jíbaros; and so on. Nor is it feasible to refine the definition of the term, unless specific social and economic features are to be attached to it; so far, that has not been done by social scientists in Puerto Rico.[4]

But the formulation of other, nationally valid sociocultural categories similar to that of the rural proletarian is a difficult task. In his study of a traditional coffee-producing community, Wolf (1956a: 203) formulates a schema of the rural class structure that includes the peasantry, "middle" farmers, landless agricultural workers, and hacendados. Comparable though different schemata are offered by other members of the team working under Steward. But in spite of the considerable data gathered, it was not possible to synthesize these items in order to produce anything like a complete picture of national class structure. The significance of this lack for present purposes is as follows: I have been contending that any approximation of the national culture of Puerto Rico must take account of the social and economic differentiation of the Puerto Rican people, since the lists of temperamental and attitudinal traits considered "typically Puerto Rican," while they often sound right, are quite unverifiable. It seems reasonable to suppose, moreover, that even shared behaviors and attitudes may be invested with very different symbolic meanings in different segments of the national population. Hence there is real utility in attempting to localize different social groupings within the national society, the distinctive behaviors and attitudes of which can be specified more or less precisely.

In the preparation of Steward's "People of Puerto Rico" the writer and his colleagues had to grapple with their inability to say much about Puerto Rican "national characteristics" that could be fairly attributed to all Puerto Ricans, and that could be validly demonstrated by any concrete facts:

> The characteristics which are ascribed to the "typical Puerto Rican" may be found among certain groups not only in the island but throughout Latin America. Many of the traits mentioned by Reuter and Petrullo and by other commentators on Puerto Rican culture may be distinctive of the Hispanic upper-class heritage but could not exist among the lower classes. To emphasize spiritual values and to be casual and indifferent to the exacting demands of modern life derives from the economic security of hereditary privilege; to be poetic presupposes literacy and opportunity to develop esthetic tastes; to be concerned with individualism, as in achieving political position, requires training and status in a power structure which stresses personal relations and maneuvers; to have aversion to manual labor implies a status which obviates the necessity of such labor—a status so highly valued that impoverished scions of upper classes insist upon wearing clean if threadbare white shirts and prefer poverty to the degrading task of working with their hands; to be romantic involves an idealization of women as well as an acceptance of the double standard.
>
> The tradition from which these and other characteristics of Latin American upper classes were derived has not wholly disappeared in Puerto Rico. These characteristics survive in considerable force, especially where super-ordinate and subordinate classes continue to function in a personal, reciprocal and hierarchical relationship, as on the hacienda. The tradition also survives in some degree in other segments of the population, for it represents a set of values which is deeply rooted in history and which has an obvious appeal to persons, Latin American or not, who repudiate the materialism of twentieth-century industrial society.
>
> These "national characteristics," however, are not now and have never been shared to any significant degree by the majority of Puerto Ricans and, for that matter, the majority of people throughout Latin America. Neither the native Indians, the imported slaves, the free workers, the resident laborers, the small farmers, the share-croppers, nor the artisans ever had the wealth, leisure, or power to participate to any important extent in what is so often described as typical Latin American behavior. The less affluent and less privileged groups never had to decide whether to shun manual labor in favor of upper-class preoccupations. They never had the chance to cultivate poetry and philosophy, for they were illiterate. Their esthetic tastes and ideologies were those of a folk society. They did not face the issue of whether to be materialistic, for the only life they knew was one of daily toil according to the culturally prescribed standards and requirements of their status. If they were hospitable, they were so within the framework of a system of personalized relations, but their hospitality lacked the lavishness possible among the upper classes.

> The traditional Hispanic upper-class patterns have been changing under the impact of an industrial society. They have been influenced by new forms of commercial development and they are being affected by close contacts with, and even extended residence in, the United States. New middle classes have emerged in Puerto Rico, and the members of these groups are striving for life goals not unlike those of the upper classes. But there are still important distinctions between the lifeways of the differing socioeconomic segments of the population. Education and mass media of communication, the radio, newspapers and the like, have by no means leveled subcultural differences. Nor would these [influences] in themselves be capable of doing so even if they were extended somewhat more equitably among the different segments than is presently the case.
>
> In short, the features which are labeled 'typically Puerto Rican' generally apply to those groups which have had the means to perpetuate the Hispanic upper-class tradition, and/or to those who have been able to utilize education and other forms of communication to the fullest, and/or to those who have access to the outside world and are in a position to maintain standards of living appropriate to *new* sets of values (Steward, 1956: 490–491).

These arguments may lead to a methodological impasse. On the one hand, generalities concerned with what is "characteristically Puerto Rican," while often having the ring of truth, do not readily lend themselves to scientific verification. On the other, statements concerned with the typical or representative attitudes of various groups or socioeconomic classes in the society, while perhaps more amendable to test and confirmation, are not readily generalized to the society as a whole. Earlier, it was asserted that what is unique about Puerto Rico probably inheres largely in the social structure of the society, rather than in its cultural content. According to this assertion, a society such as Cuba or the Dominican Republic may share a very substantial part of its culture with Puerto Rico, but the structures of these three societies are distinguishably different. It is worth attempting to suggest what may make Puerto Rican societal structure distinctive.

Most useful for initiating such an exploration would be an up-to-date analysis of Island society comparable to that carried out by Steward's students in 1948–49 and published in 1956. Social and economic change in the past decade has been extremely rapid and thoroughgoing but information on such change remains scattered and sparse. We know that such phenomena as emigration, industralization, increased productivity (and its effects on income levels), and much improved media of communication and transportation have intensified many currents of change already operative nearly twenty years ago when Steward's students began their work. Even census data (for 1950 and 1960) give powerful evidence of change. For instance, the category for male professional and technical workers shows a 58.7 percent increase between 1950 and 1960; the comparable category for females a 58.6 percent increase. At the same time, the category of farmers and farm managers (male) shows a 50.6 percent decrease in the same period, and that of farm laborers and unpaid family workers an 83.7 percent decrease. Even more recent, and more telling, are figures given in an advance report on the Labor Department's study of family income of working families (1963). The average income went from $1,717 per family in 1953 to $3,314 in 1963, an improvement of 93 percent. In 1953, while only 9.4 percent of families made $2,000 or more per year, in 1963 49.3 percent of all families are earning $2,000 or above. Over longer time periods, the data are even more striking. In 1941, 80 percent of all families made less than $500 yearly; in 1963, only 2.3 percent of all families made less. In the absence of sociological data on the members of these categories, all one can do is suggest strongly that important atitudinal changes undoubtedly attach to the changes in the categories themselves.

It should surprise no one that the many inferences made in the press concerning such changes have usually lacked adequate sociological data to back them up. For those who have viewed modernization, industrialization, and economic change as mere reflexes of a general process of "Americanization," the trend has been downhill so far as Puerto Rican culture and identity are concerned. For those others who see such changes as beneficial to the people of Puerto Rico, the concrete benefits far outweigh any cultural "losses." But, again, neither view locates itself adequately in the facts, for the necessary research simply has not been done.

In a report on a brief visit to a rural proletarian South Coast community (Mintz, 1965), I attempted to sketch in some of the direct implications of recent economic change for local people, and was able to add my findings to those of the Puerto Rican sociologist José Hernández Alvárez, who worked in a neighboring village in the same barrio several years ago. The results of the economic changes themselves are readily seen and represent a general upward movement in earning power, followed by changes in consumption, aspirations, and expectations. So far as culture content is concerned, it is clear that North American culture items have supplanted other, more traditional items, though the process is more one of adition than of replacement. As Hernández Alvárez points out (1964: 143–157), changes in economic position have also begun to fragment the rural proletarian subgroup into higher and lower sectors, each marked by certain characteristic attitudes. The homogeneity in values that I discovered in the same community in 1948–49 has begun noticeably to give way to new internal distinctions of value and attitude, though admittedly little reliance can be put on information collected so impressionistically and on so brief a visit. At least one can contend that sociocultural change may indeed take place at extremely rapid rates, even though we lack sufficient evidence of the impact of such change on the ideologies of different groups in Puerto Rico. At the time that I carried out fieldwork on the South Coast in 1948–49, it was my feeling that emigration provided the only significant means by which rural proletarians could substantially change their life-chances, their culture, and thereby their value system. But in less than two decades, much of life has changed among these people, to judge by an admittedly brief revisit. Changes in other segments of the national population, as indicated by census statistics, the growth of new sorts of middle-class groupings, and some research findings (cf., for instance, Rogler, 1965: 34–36) do not prove that the elusive phenomenon called Puerto Rican "national character" is now different (or more "deteriorated", as some critics might say), but I believe that they argue for such a position.

In the preceding pages, I have tried to present in brief form some of the atempts by scholars of Puerto Rico to identify and describe Puerto Rican culture and identity. It will be seen that writers have approached this theme from numerous different perspectives. For some observers, the aim has been to localize certain widely held attitudes of values that supposedly typify the Puerto Rican people as a whole. For others, this objective seems impossible of attainment, at least insofar as an operational tests of validity are concerned, and differential group values (as expressed in different subcultures) need first to be delineated. I have attempted to suggest that any characterization of the Puerto Rican people on grounds of shared culture elements or culture complexes is likely to remain rather weak, because of the significant social, economic, and subcultural differentiation of the population. Though this assertion is surely open to criticism, it is advanced precisely in order to elicit contrary claims.

PART IV. CONCLUSIONS

Throughout this report, it has been contended that the term "culture" has been used carelessly and unreflectively by many students of Puerto Rico. An attempt has been made here to distinguish between "culture" as a term applying to the esthetic product of an elite, and as an anthropological category covering all of the learned social and symbolic behavior of the members of a society, and its consequences. It is also necessary to differentiate what might be called "national character" or "national characteristics" from the variant sets of behaviors and values typifying different social segments of the same polity. Thus, on the one hand, one must seperate out the esthetic products of a literate, historically conscious minority from those of "the people," widely conceived; on the other, one must distinguish those widely held "Puerto Rican" traits from those marking special groups or classes within the total society.

It should be plain enough that, while one may regard the novels of a Laguerre and the "plenas" and "décimas" of the countryside as fitting with equal justification within Puerto Rican culture, they represent very different aspects of that culture, and are to a large extent mutually exclusive aspects. Similarly, while there may be some grounds for claiming that disdain for manual labor, for example, is an historically determined "Puerto Rican" cultural attitude, it must be noted that this would definitely not be true for many, or possibly even most, Puerto Ricans. Finally, what goes by the label of "Puerto Rican national characteristic"—for instance, the speaking of Spanish, or a sexual double standard—may not only fail to hold for everyone, but in all likelihood has very different symbolic connotations in different social segments of the national society.

These qualifications should suggest the difficulties that one faces in seeking to treat Puerto Rican culture as if it were some sort of concrete undifferentiated entity. Nor is the problem in any way a uniquely Puerto Rican one; few are the social scientists so blithe and confident as to deal with greater assurance in the case of French culture, Russian culture, or North American culture. The fact is that modern nations do not lend themselves readily to holistic analyses of this sort, and the layman's notions about national character rarely find confirmation in the work of social scientists, no matter how convincing such notions may seem. "German" authoritarianism, "French" romanticism, and "English" doggedness may be delightful conversational counters for many observers, but no one has been truly successful in transforming such imputations into solid social science facts.

If any basis at all is to be discovered for formulations of this sort, I believe it will probably be located in one of four spheres of inquiry: social history; value-categories; socialization and child-training patterns; or "social idioms." Numerous attempts have been made to etch in some national identity—Russian, for instance, or French, or Mexican—by appeals to one or another of these four kinds of data. In the case of Puerto Rico, those few attempts that have been made to spell out the essentially Puerto Rican have not been conspicuously successful, though I have tried in this report to refer to the findings of some studies directed to this end.[5] One is left with the feeling that, if there are genuinely distinctive character traits or values we may confidently call Puerto Rican, they are extremely hard to enumerate and harder yet to corroborate by social science methods.

We have seen that Puerto Rican society was propelled in a special direction by the lengthy isolation that ensued after the discovery of the Mexican mainland (1519), and that continued almost unabated until the very start of the 19th century. During this period, Puerto Rico was effectively controlled by a small military bureaucracy, Spanish rather than creole in identity, and little involved in the problems of Puerto Rican development. The rural population included persons of heterogeneous genetic and cultural origins, who adapted to life on the island's "internal frontier" by maintaining a substantial detachment from public affairs of any kind. It was because of these rural highland folk that there originated the image of the jíbaro—unletered, laconic, shrewd, shy to the point of seeming semi-feral, and "unspoiled". Although slavery was important at various times between 1510 and 1815, it did not become the major basis for economic activity as in the non-Hispanic Antilles, nor did race emerge as a basic social assortative device. The insular social structure, however, was marked by a clear separation between the urbanite and the countryman and between the Spaniard and the creole.

It is important to keep in mind at the same time that the bulking rural population did not preserve Spanish folk culture in some state of unchanged 16th-century purity, as has sometimes been suggested. Many features of the Spanish heritage were sloughed off or supplanted in the Puerto Rican rural setting, and other cultures—Amerind, African, and non-Hispanic European—contributed to the growth of a particular Puerto Rican rural subculture. Though certain parallel processes occurred in Cuba, Santo Domingo and elsewhere, Puerto Rico, like any other society, has had its own unique cultural history.

After 1800, the social structure of the island changed more sharply, especially as the development of the slave-based plantation system was accelerated. Slavery and foreign immigration grew, and commercial expansion replaced the military emphasis that had dominated Puerto Rico's position in the Spanish imperial system. Early pioneers in commerce, whose main concern at the start of the 19th century was to win economic concessions from the Crown, soon became more concerned with the extraction of labor effort from the rural population of the island; both slavery and forced labor were encouraged by the concessions of 1815 (Fernández Méndez, 1959). In other words, once the Crown agreed to permit rapid economic development in the island, Puerto Rico entrepreneurs separated themselves ideologically and by identity from their less privileged countrymen, in the quest for higher profits and swifter economic growth. A sense of Puerto Rico nationality, utterly dormant in the 18th century, was stunted anew, as the plantation system expanded, and free but landless countrymen, white and colored alike, were forced into plantation labor.

After 1850, Spanish controls over Puerto Rican economic activities were intensified once more, leading to the growth of a more nationalistic sentiment among national leaders. Divisions in political view had appeared in the struggle over abolition, with the newer hacendado group more anxious to maintain slavery than the older, more powerful plantation owners. Further divisions, between Spaniards and creoles, also became sharper as questions concerning Puerto Rico's future political status began to be asked. Even earlier, in the 1830's, the United States had begun to emerge as an important potential market for Puerto Rican products, and the inescapable presence of the "Colossus of the North" inevitably influenced Puerto Rican political thinking. More and more, after 1850, Puerto Rican political opinion failed to divide simply into two camps—for Spain, or for autonomy—and the political issues were complicated by the differing stakes of various groups on the island. There were those fundamentally loyal to Spain and essentially accepting of Puerto Rico's dependent status under the Crown; there were those others who desired greater autonomy, the abolition of slavery, and a stronger orientation to the United States; finally, there were the separatists, who sought in varying degrees an autonomous or independent Puerto Rico.

In the late 19th century, beginning with the active struggle for abolition, there emerged the first clear expression of political nationalism in Puerto Rico. It was related to the continued dominance of Spaniards in all administrative circles, to the differential favorable treatment accorded Spaniards in contrast to creoles, and to the rapid economic gains in island economic life of capital-holding Spanish mercantile groups. To a great extent, Puerto Rican entrepreneurs and businessmen had been unable to maintain the economic momentum of the early 19th century, since neither sugar nor coffee had been continuously lucrative, and the island had come to depend heavily upon Spanish merchant capitalists and banks. In the closing decades of the 19th century, the barriers between creoles and Spaniards became sharper, and political repression of creole separatists grew. Though the weakening of Spanish overseas strength made possible the political reforms of 1897, these reforms were immediately terminated by North American rule.

The saga of Puerto Rican growth after 1897 is too well known to require much repetition here. Decades of governmental neglect were accompanied by a frighteningly rapid expansion of North American large-scale economic interests. By the onset of the world depression, Puerto Rico had become a plantation colony par excellence, with all of the worst features of absentee imperialism. It is surely worth remarking that, no matter how strongly this is stated, very few North American scholars of Puerto Rico will take issue with it, for there is precious little to argue about. Puerto Rico thus became an outstanding example of that rare phenomenon, undisguised North American colonialism and economic imperialism.

The cultural effects of North American rule likewise require no documentation here. Significant institutional changes, most important being the ambiguous political incorporation of the island into the North American system, were accompanied by the introduction of English as the language of instruction, and the growth of transportation, communication, and health systems of a more modern sort. While it is commonly supposed that the cultural impact was felt most sharply in urban centers and among members of the more privileged classes, the plantation system introduced widespread societal and cultural changes in rural areas, particularly along the sugar coasts (Mintz, 1960). To the extent that culture change depended mainly on improved buying power, it was within the urban middle and upper classes that the North American impact might be most easily witnessed, but in some regards, social and cultural change was even more dramatic and thoroughgoing among rural working people. Nor should it be forgotten that continued change among Puerto Rican working folk has often consisted of a taking-on of cultural items and practices already well established among middle class and upper class elements in the cities. (Surely those who most loudly bemoan the extirpation of Puerto Rican culture in the countryside should notice that they themselves are much more Americanized in their styles of life than the country folk—and that the Americanization of the country folk largely consists of taking on the consumption norms of their urban class betters.)

After 1940, some of the most nakedly exploitative elements in the North American hegemony were eliminated or reduced in importance, while the issue of political status was, for most Puerto Ricans, left to one side. The electoral strength of the Popular Democratic Party grew steadily during the 1940's, and to some extent the party ideology and membership changed, as power became more firmly institutionalized. In recent years, the issue of status has been quite vigorously revived, though electoral results continue to give the Popular Party position unmatched support.

Changes since 1940 have clearly brought more and more Puerto Ricans into intimate contact with North America, through migration, expansion of mass media, increasing education, and the implicit acceptance of the majority party's position on continued political association. Not only have many Puerto Ricans settled in the mainland United States or worked there for lengthy periods, thus familiarizing themselves with North American culture and values, but also the number of North Americans who visit or live in Puerto Rico has risen substantially. It can be asserted that the influence of North American culture was less before 1940, even though the exploitative elements in North American control were sharper in those years.

The way Puerto Ricans regard their present cultural status varies significantly, according to the ways in which they participate in all of these recent changes. It is my impression that the problem of cultural identity is not felt acutely by working class persons—an assertion which is not, however, based on reliable up-to-date sociological or anthropological study. Working people in Puerto Rico have been exposed to North American influences for over half a century, but until the 1940's these influences only slowly affected their ability to assimilate new cultural forms. In the highlands of Puerto Rico, North American cultural influences consisted largely of increasing pressure toward migration to the coasts, as the plantation economy expanded and the peasant economy contracted. Traditional highland culture and social forms were "collapsed" by this pressure, however. In coastal areas, such influences were felt through the imposition of the plantation regimen itself: wage labor replaced payment in kind; standardized work rules replaced personalistic affiliations; store-bought consumers' goods replaced homegrown foods; more modern medical services replaced traditional herbal remedies; and so on. But since real incomes remained extremely low, what I would call "consumer-based acculturation" was slow.

During World War II and after, higher worker incomes, electrification, roadbuilding, military service, the rise in emigration, rural industrialization, and a new level of political activity and consciousness began to effect much more basic changes in working class styles of life. Since about 1950, these changes have come with increasing rapidity, and my report on Barrio Jauca (Mintz, 1965), when taken in conjunction with earlier work (Mintz, 1951a, 1953b, 1960; Steward, 1956) suggests, at least minimally, just how rapid and thoroughgoing such changes have become. Nevertheless, I must repeat that, to a very considerable extent, changes in life-style among rural working people seem to consist in large part of a taking-on of forms which have long been standard among the urban middle classes of Puerto Rico, and that "Americanization" or the "destruction of Puerto Rican culture" in this case consists in good degree of a continuation of what is by now an established process in other segments of Puerto Rican society.

It is, of course, a different matter for urban folk and members of the middle classes generally. These are people who, if they have been of middle class status for more than 20 years, have been long practicing those very forms of behavior they may now deplore as they spread among poorer rural folk. To the extent that this is true, I find it difficult to see why it is more tragic for rural workers to give up the décima for rock-and-roll than it is for urban middle class persons to give up the danzas of Morel Campos for either rock-and-roll or the music of Pablo Casals. However, that rock-and-roll is inexorably supplanting the décima is undeniable, it seems to me, and this musical form is American—as any Englishman, Frenchman, or Russian can prove. It is difficult to avoid thinking that certain segments of the middle class, at least, feel themselves better prepared than their lower class compatriots to sift out the "socially good" from the "socially bad" in North American culture. If so, one is tempted to wonder how, were Puerto Rico politically sovereign (as it surely has every right to be, should its citizens so desire), those who know what is better for others would organize a democratic society in which the "socially good" opinions would prevail.

It is clear why cultural ambivalence might be stronger among the middle class elements of Puerto Rican society. Cultural "self-consciousness" is obviously more acute when education serves to deepen one's sense of affiliation to an abstract ideology of identity. Middle class Puerto Ricans, at least in superficial ways, often exaggerate their awareness of the norms, beliefs, and attitudes of their lower class fellow citizens. Though they are sometimes prepared to admit as much—no anthropologist who has worked in the Puerto Rican countryside has missed the experience of having at least one Puerto Rican university colleague admit that he controlled fewer facts about the rural sector than the anthropological stranger—the feeling inevitably persists that only a Puerto Rican can know Puerto Rico, no matter what the individual experiences of the claimant. The assertion is, paradoxically, both true and false. Middle class North Americans would of course react in precisely the same way to the statements of a foreign anthropologist who had worked intimately in the American countryside. Yet any honest North American—anthropologists emphatically included!—would also know that a foreign social scientists who had, for instance, worked in an obscure western or midwestern hamlet for a year or two might know at least as much about the culture of the people there, as he himself would know simply by virtue of being North American.

These statements do nothing, however, to diminish the difficulties of presenting a coherent picture of a unitary Puerto Rican culture. It is possible to list a series of adjectives ("docile," "resigned," "tolerant"), of culture traits (décimas, baquines, coffee-drinking, the speaking of Spanish), of institutional subsystems (compadrazgo, noviazgo), of widely-held attitudes and values expressed in language and in social behavior (machismo, personalismo, respeto, relajo), but I do not believe we are able at this time to describe an undifferentiated totality called "Puerto Rican culture."

Puerto Rico's particular history has given rise to a peculiar and unique set of social and economic classes and interest groups. Its political and economic dependence upon the United States has informed and seriously affected the beliefs and behaviors of members of these groups. The processes set in motion by the North American hegemony have continued to operate, and at accelerated speeds in recent decades. Emigration, industrialization, and economic growth have differentially changed the composition of the various groups and classes that make up the society, and have introduced new values and new value-conflicts. Underlying these processes, however, many observers would contend that there exists some ill-defined ideological core that still governs each individual Puerto Rican's characteristic "pitch" or "set" with regard to his identity. In discussing another "Latin" society, Mexico, Eric Wolf has written:

> It seems possible to define 'national character' operationally as those cultural forms or mechanisms which groups involved in the same overall web of relations can use in their formal and informal dealings with each other. Such a view need not imply that all nationals think or behave alike, nor that the forms used may not serve different fuctions in different social contexts. Such common forms must exist if communication between the different constituent groups of a complex society are to be established and maintained (1956b: 1075).

This suggestion may prove most useful in saying more about what is distinctively Puerto Rican and, in at least some sense, "common" to the Puerto Rican people, than anything else. But the careful research necessary to put it to the test largely remains to be done. One might expect that more work along these lines [one such pioneering paper, I believe, is that of Lauria (1965)], will not so much prove that there is a Puerto Rican identity or national character, so much as analyze how such character or identity works. From this perspective, much that has been said about the problem of identity is largely irrelevant, unless it proceeds from the interpretation of concrete statements and behaviors of the Puerto Rican people themselves. Such an insistence on empiricism will, of course, be regarded by some as a merely inevitable consequence of the writer's North American cultural identity, but surely social science proof will have to consist of more than a series of statements that "sound right."

The issue is complicated by the rapid change that has marked Puerto Rican life in the past quarter of a century. As more and more Puerto Ricans acquire an education, migrate to the United States (often to return), increase their buying power and their consumer choices, acquire new aspirations for themselves and their children, and begin to get a better sense of the wider world, the impact on Puerto Rican culture—however we try to approximate it—is one of inevitable change. The island is not a separate society in the same sense as an independent country with a long sovereign career; United States control and closeness has had the effect, to some degree, of making Puerto Rico a part of itself. The "web of relations" to which Wolf refers in discussing national character now frequently includes North Americans as well as Puerto Ricans. We cannot discuss Puerto Rico as if its relationship with the United States up to this time had had no effect on the Puerto Rican people, or assume that political change can be initiated from a baseline of 1900. Puerto Rico, in other words, is as it is, not as it was a half a century ago. Nothing can restore it to its cultural condition at that time, not even total and thoroughgoing isolation from the United States. Some may bemoan this assertion, but I believe it to be quite inarguable.

The various changes have had different effects on individuals and on socioeconomic groups. For some, they have stiffened the resistance to change and to outside influence, while for others they have heightened the eagerness for yet more change. Probably the more change-oriented persons are to be found principally among highly acculturated upper class groups, and among those of the very poor who have achieved a significantly higher standard of living as a result of recent changes. The growing middle classes, consisting often of service purveyors, government employees, university folk, and small-scale merchants, probably manifest the widest variety of different opinions concerning their culture, and may very well be those most ambivalent about the directions of change. All of this, however, is still in the realm of supposition, since the necessary research to test it also remains to be done.

I have tried here to expose the difficulties implicit in attempting to formulate a picture of Puerto Rican culture as some undifferentiated entity. Where possible, information has been given on some of those features of Puerto Rican life that are commonly regarded as part of a "national culture." At the same time, I have sought to show that our ability to generalize from these features is quite strictly qualified by the social, economic, and ideological complexity of Puerto Rican life. I recognize that this approach has left us without an entirely satisfactory answer to the question of Puerto Rican culture and national identity. I hope at least that it has suggested why, to some extent, the question itself needs to be asked in markedly different ways.

Appendix A

The following appendix is, except for a few minor additions and a brief concluding summary, the work of Mrs. Jane Collier, a Harvard graduate student in anthropology. It is an attempt to derive a profile of Puerto Rican values by the application of the Kluckhohn Binary

Value Categories to published materials on the Puerto Rican people. Since it is based wholly on such published materials, it is of course no stronger or more consistent than its sources; nevertheless, I felt it would be useful to have Mrs. Collier attempt just such an application.

The Kluckhohn schema was developed in order to obtain general ratings or scores for different societies, based on some weighing of attitude and belief. It consists of a series of polar terms or categories, against which information on a particular society may be checked off. In the following pages, each category is named and described; the derived value imputed by the scorer to Puerto Rican culture is then given in underlined capitals, and comments and quotes are marshalled from the sources employed, to substantiate the scoring. Thus, for instance, the first category is "Determinate-Indeterminate, with reference to the Supernatural." People are believed to see the supernatural world either as primarily orderly and consistent, or as primarily whimsical and capricious. Criteria for these contrasting positions are listed, a value attributed to the Puerto Ricans, and the relevant findings of social scientists who have worked in Puerto Rico are noted.

Mrs. Collier was not able to make a complete survey of the literature; this would have been an enormous task, and the addition of many more materials would not have guaranteed by itself any more reliable result. Still, certain consistencies do emerge. Mrs. Collier also stressed that her work was probably influenced to some extent by her previous experience with the method. All the same, I believe the findings may be of genuine interest.

DETERMINATE—INDETERMINATE: Supernatural

Description:

Determinate	*Indeterminate*
People see the supernatural world as an orderly world where supernatural events are either predictable to a certain extent, or are consistent with some system of lawful order.	People see the supernatural world as one of chance or caprice, where unpredictability or inconsistency predominates.

Criteria:

1. Supernatural beings have clearly defined roles, functions or positions.	1. The positions of supernatural beings or their roles are poorly defined.
2. The religious system is in a highly integrated and internally consistent conceptual scheme.	2. The religious system is poorly integrated.
3. The gods act reasonably, orderly or lawfully. They have regular habits.	3. The gods have irregular habits or act equivocally or are voluntaristic and capricious.

Ranking: DETERMINATE

The supernatural world is basically that of the Catholic church, which is very highly structured. People realize that there is order, even if they do not understand all the theological details. The Protestant sects also see the supernatural world as Determinate. The only major conflicting view is that of the spiritualists, but even the spirits they deal with seem to be subject to "laws." Seda Bonilla (1964: 79–80) notes that at death the spirit of the deceased is left in an innocent and vulnerable state, so that it can be tricked (by magical devices) into performing witchcraft. These spirits do not act by chance or caprice. They are specifically directed by humans to perform the acts they do.

DETERMINATE—INDETERMINATE: Social

Description:

Determinate	*Indeterminate*
The social world is orderly. Man's roles are well-defined, unambiguous and social behavior is consistent or viewed as consistent.	The social world contains elements of uncertainty or instability. People sometimes behave inconsistently or are viewed as behaving inconsistently.

Criteria:

1. Prestige, class, wealth, and power roles are clearly defined. The patterns of other roles are stable and unambiguous.	1. Differences of prestige, wealth, class, leadership are variable, or are not clearly defined. Other roles are flexible, subject to change, or are ambiguous.
2. The society is strongly unified and organized.	2. The society is very loosely organized.
3. People have regular habits. Their living patterns are highly structured.	3. People have irregular habits. They live spontaneously.

Ranking: DETERMINATE

Reuter, 1946. Puerto Ricans are not socially mobile. Traditional ways are deeply embedded. The body of class sentiments lives on.

Landy, 1959: 51. "From birth the child is inculcated with the expectations and duties of his parents' class."

Manners, in Steward, 1956: 144–145. "Since all societies demand specific kinds of reciprocal relationships among their various members, the Tabara infant learns early the kind of behavior which is considered appropriate to him and to other members of the society. He is taught both by precept and example what are the proper responses to other children and to adults of both sexes and all economic and social levels. At the same time he learns the prescribed kinds of behavior required of him toward all other people in most possible situations. * * * He learns, too, that his own position is not inevitably immutable, not forever determined by the accident of birth, but that he or anyone else may actually move up in the social hierarchy and, as he does so, alter the respect relationships between himself and all others."

Seda Bonilla, 1964 : 116. Liberty is feared because it is taken to mean chaos where each does what he pleases.

The Puerto Rican world seems basically determinate. Class roles are well defined, and while a person's class may vary with his wealth, there is little ambiguity about what kind of behavior a particular status demands. This may be breaking down now, however, because of a proliferation of statuses as new jobs and positions are created which do not readily fit into the old hierarchy. A man in such a new position may be in doubt as to what type of behavior he should exhibit. But basically the Puerto Ricans seem to want an orderly world in which behavior is regulated by social norms.

GOOD—EVIL: Supernatural

Description:

Good	*Evil*
Supernatural beings are mostly supportive and good. They are more benevolent than malevolent.	Supernatural beings are austere, dangerous, or malicious. They are basically evil.

Criteria:

1. Good aspects of the principal supernatural beings predominate over the bad ones. They are more helpful than harmful.	1. The principal supernatural beings are more evil and fear-inspiring than supportive or friendly.
2. Supernatural beings actively intervene to aid humans.	2. Supernatural beings actively intervene to punish or harm humans.
3. Some supernaturals specialize in helping humans and are more prominent than those supernaturals which may specialize in doing harm.	3. Some supernaturals specialize in doing harm to humans, and are more prominent than those supernaturals which may help humans.
4. People have feelings of affection for some supernaturals.	4. People have few feelings of affection for supernaturals.

Ranking: GOOD

Wolf in Steward, 1956: 214. "The saints are said to guard the household. At regularly spaced intervals the household offers certain goods to the saint, who is expected to reciprocate by furnishing the household with luck and prosperity."

Seda Bonilla, 1964: 79. The spirits of the dead are left innocent right after death.

Mintz in Steward, 1956: 408. ". . . local conversation about witchcraft and sorcery is mainly trivial."

The saints intervene to help men and they are the most important supernatural beings, at least to the lower classes. Even the spirits of the dead which can be manipulated by evil people are good and innocent if left alone. I found no evidence that any emphasis was placed on the devil or on evil spirits.

BUT:

Padilla Seda in Steward, 1956: 308, makes reference to some use of, and belief in, black magic, in the north coast sugarcane community she studied, and relates this to a high local level of insecurity. Steward's other associates found very little supporting material in other communities.

GOOD—EVIL: Social

Description:

Good	*Evil*
Human nature is viewed as being basically good.	Human nature is viewed as being basically evil.

Criteria:

Good	*Evil*
1. People are regarded as good until proven evil.	1. People are regarded as evil, until proven good.
2. People prefer to be trusting rather than suspicious.	2. People are highly suspicious, mistrustful, skeptical.
3. People are conceived as responsive and friendly.	3. People conceived of as unresponsive, dishonest, aggressive, predominantly evil or hostile.

Ranking: GOOD—EVIL

Brown, 1964: 49. People distrust others. They have fears of being exploited. Most people doubt that man is by nature cooperative.

Landy, 1959: 246. The male's desire for trust is often frustrated, which leads to a distrust of others.

Seda Bonilla, 1964: 113. People fear being tricked. They learn early not to trust appearances or to trust anybody.

BUT:

Brown, 1964: 48. People "see themselves as being generous, always willing to help their neighbors."

Human nature is conceived of as variable. There is some good because people see themselves as such and in their continual efforts to set up relationships "de confianza" they are trying to find others as good as themselves. Everyday life, however, seems to prove that people are out to exploit and trick one another, but the individual nevertheless goes on trying to find a friend worthy of "confianza" because of his own basic needs. Insofar as others fail to live up to the ideal, the individual is forced back into his belief about the faithlessness of men. Finally, all of these data come only from the lower classes; perhaps the upper classes believe more in the goodness of man.

RETIRING—GREGARIOUS

Description:

Retiring	*Gregarious*
People can be alone, can withdraw from time to time and do not need the presence of other people. Solitude is valued just as much as sociability.	People like to associate with others as much as possible. Social participation is emphasized. There is a constant desire for company and group activities. The individual may be forced to participate in social activities.

Criteria:

Retiring	*Gregarious*
1. Enjoyment of privacy.	1. Avoidance of solitude.

Ranking: GREGARIOUS

Rogler, 1940: 179. "If a Comerieño is alone, he is very likely to be lonesome or, as he describes it, *triste*. If he is not lonesome when alone, he is likely to be considered 'peculiar.' Activities conducted in privacy are unpopular. Comerio is 'full of life,' and public life at that."

INDIVIDUAL—GROUP

Description:

Individual	*Group*
Emphasis on the rights of the individual.	Emphasis on the duties of citizenship, or on the duties of the individual for the group.
The individual is given priority. *Obligations are mainly to the self.*	The collectivity is given priority. *Obligations are mainly to society*, the extended family, or other groups.
Collectivities are a means to the ends of individuals, and there is little or no subjugation of self interests.	Individuals are a means to the ends of some collectivity. Subjugation of self interests to group or institutional interests.

Ranking: INDIVIDUAL

Lewis, 1963: 248–9. People in the professions see their new status less as an opportunity to serve the public than as an avenue to personal advancement. They exhibit little sense of social obligation.

Wolf in Steward, 1956: 207. There is a cooperative labor exchange system among poor farmers.

208. "All these relationships take place between equals and demand the exchanges of equivalent values in symmetrical fashion. Their performance is socially valuable, and the man who performs them carefully is rewarded with prestige. The exchange complex has given rise to an image of the ideal neighbor. He is a person who offers his services willingly, who sends meat to his neighbors whenever an animal is slaughtered in his house, who arranges to have the women of his household take care of a neighbor's house when the woman there is in labor and who gives readily of his resources and his knowledges. At the same time, he is expected to be 'shrewd' (listo). He must make sure that he does not give out more in the long run than he receives."

Rogler, 1940: 60. "Mutual aid is an intraclass, not an interclass phenomenon, and its economic importance among the poor cannot be overemphasized."

Rogler, 1940: 61. "The survival of large numbers of families is dependent upon aid received from neighbors."

Mintz in Steward, 1956: 366. "The maintenance of good relationships with one's face-to-face associates is one of the best local guarantees of security, and thrift is not valued highly in the barrio."

Seda Bonilla, 1964: 116. People fear to have anything because others will accuse them of not helping those in need. People try to have nothing, to be nothing.

Landy, 1959: 49–50. "It is not unusual for lower-class persons to perform services free for middle and upper class members because this is their trabajo de compromiso (work of obligation)."

This category shows quite a range of behavior in Puerto Rico, especially among the lower classes. The middle and upper classes seem to be more inclined to be individual, with obligations primarily to the self and the immediate nuclear family. Their emphasis is on getting ahead or at least maintaining position. This is not to say that they don't acknowledge obligations to more distant relatives and to compadres, but such obligations are probably dropped if they become too burdensome or are a social liability.

The situation in the lower classes is far more complex. In very traditional communities such as that described by Wolf, 1956a, the individual forms part of an extensive network of rights and obligations. Proper performance of one's role leads both to prestige and to security. More or less the same thing is true in Comerío where it is recognized that cooperation is necessary to life. But in both these cases there is the strong underlying feeling that cooperation with the group in the end benefits the self. This is even more strongly recognized in Cañamelar, where cooperation is seen as a guarantee of security for the individual. But the situation has been turned upside down in Tipán as seen by Seda Bonilla, 1964. There, the mutual obligations have become a burden to the self, and individuals try to escape from their duties.

There is also a system of rights and obligations between classes, with the upper classes dispensing patronage and the lower classes providing services. Again, proper performance of one's role eventually benefits the self.

Puerto Rico is very interesting in this category because, while there is a great deal of cooperation entailing many obligations which are performed willingly, people nevertheless still see the collectivity as a means to the ends of the individuals.

(I am not very happy with the score on this category. I feel that I was forced into a score of "Individual" by the statements that I quoted above. But I still wonder if the American ethnographers who made the statements were perhaps overestimating the individual advantage derived from cooperation.—J. C.)

SELF—OTHER

Description:

Self	*Other*
Self concern predominates.	Emphatic concern for other people predominates.

Criteria:

1. Lack of concern over friendships or affectionate relationships.	1. Concern over maintaining or establishing warm friendships and affectionate relationships.
2. No concern for others in sickness or difficulties.	2. Pity, compassion, consolation of others in sickness or difficulty.

Self	*Other*
3. Extortion from others, exploitation of others, taking advantage of people.	3. Unrequired, unsolicited cooperation.
4. Intolerance of what others believe or do. No attempt to understand their motives.	4. Tolerance shown for what others believe or do. Ability to understand the feelings of others.

Ranking: SELF—OTHER

This is a problem category. Everyone seems to agree that Puerto Ricans are very interested in building and maintaining warm interpersonal relationships.

Petrullo, 1947: 129. Puerto Ricans cultivated the arts of living, among which figured personal relationships, rather than seeking wealth.

Landy, 1959: 168–9. Males are constantly trying to form relationships *de confianza* with other males.

Brown, 1964: 48. "Residents of Viví Abajo see themselves as generous, always willing to help their neighbors."

People even see themselves as capable of being warm and feeling emphatic concern. But the actual state of affairs is apparently quite different. People want trust but they cannot find it. While the individual sees himself as warm and understanding, he fears being exploited by others.

Landy, 1959: 246. "The more he seeks a close relationship with other males, the less the young man is apt to find it. When relationships are established they are brittle and easily fragmented. Thus the male's poignant desires find little permanent gratification, and repeated short-lived relationships lead to a distrust of others. At the same time, however, he longs for nothing so much as to be able to trust the relationship of other men. And so he looks continually for trust, or confianza, relationships. But he looks within a lonely crowd in which confianza relationships are rare because while the demand is great, supply is short."

Brown, 1964: 49. "In general, inhabitants of Viví Abajo are plagued by a distrust of others. They feel that they cannot confide in the majority of people; they never know with utter confidence on whom they can rely in difficult moments. According to them, most people tend to take care of themselves first and worry about others later, if at all. Each person is constantly watchful, for fear of being exploited by someone else. Many in the community believe that no one cares if a neighbor is on the way to failure, but several feel that at least a few people are sympathetic."

AUTONOMY—DEPENDENCE

Description:

Autonomy	*Dependence*
The adult individual tends to be self-reliant and self-sufficient.	The adult individual is dependent on other persons or on the group.

Criteria:

Autonomy	*Dependence*
1. Source of decisions located within the self. A person's behavior is not easily influenced by others.	1. Source of decisions, or basis of decision is external. No reliance on internal judgment. A person's behavior is easily influenced by others.
2. Attempts to do without help when ill, or in other circumstances of need. Feeling that the individual can take care of himself.	2. Dependence on institutions or persons for protection and satisfaction of needs.
3. Teaching of independence and self-responsibility.	3. Teaching of obligations and responsibility to others.

Ranking: DEPENDENCE

Brown, 1964: 48. "They are sensitive to other's opinions of them; they would choose to suffer hardship rather than do work which other people would criticize."

Lewis, 1963: 289. "The fear of being exposed to 'what other people will say' inhibits many a person from openly accepting a new solution to an old problem."

478. "In part, it is the terror of ridicule that makes the Puerto Rican adult so conscious of respect."

Petrullo, 1947: p. 128. "In short, there is a greater tendency [illegible] lean on someone else for a solution of one's problems than there is in Protestant societies."

I have given very few examples for this category because it is so clear cut. The Puerto Ricans are extremly dependent—on their superiors for favors, on their peers for aid, on their families for support—and they are also extremely dependent on the opinion of others. Little children are born dependent and remain so throughout life, although the character of the dependency changes (see Landy, 1959).

DISCIPLINE—FULFILLMENT

Description:

Some cultures tend to repress spontaneity in the effort to maintain an even-tempered social scene, while others prefer to give full expression to spontaneity and are less worried abou the consequence of impulsive actions.

Criteria:

Discipline	*Fulfillment*
1. Emphasis on self-control.	1. Emphasis on self-expression.
2. Emphasis on maintaining an even balance of social actions. Social constraint and reserve.	2. No concern with balanced social actions. Lack of social constraint.
3. Moderation.	3. Laxity, pleasure permitting, affirmation.
4. Asceticism, religious fasting.	4. Intoxication or overindulgence.
5. Strictness, austerity, denial, abstinence.	5. Self-realization, orgaistic tendencies.

2

Ranking: FULFILLMENT

Rogler, 1940: 181. "There is little social restraint placed upon the overt expression of those moods or sentiments that are called out by social stimuli."

Landy, 1959: 252. "The comparative inability of the adult Vallecanese to postpone gratifications in terms of anticipated future rewards."

Puerto Ricans seem to emphasize self-expression; however, the amount of freedom is severely limited by the individual's fear of being criticized by others.

BUT:

Seda Bonilla, 1963: 111. Men should not give free reign to emotions. Emotion "means" aggressiveness.

Aggressiveness, if one believes Kathleen Wolf (1952), is strictly controlled in both the middle and the lower classes. This limit on aggressiveness, however, does not seem enough to change the scoring of this category.

ACTIVE—ACCEPTANT

Description:

This category refers to the way man responds to the social world. He may accept it or seek to change it in some way.

Criteria:

Active	*Acceptant*
1. Dissatisfaction with people or society. A desire for improvement or change.	1. Acceptance of people and society.
2. Acts of autonomy sometimes take the form of rebellion in extreme cases.	2. Acts of autonomy sometimes take the form of withdrawal.
3. Social mobility.	3. Litle social mobility.
4. Initiative or impatience concerning social actions of others.	4. Tolerance or resignation concerning social actions of others.

Ranking: ACTIVE--ACCEPTANT

There is definitely an "active" group in Puerto Rico. The government is clearly active in the changes and reforms that it is trying to bring about. The question remains, however, as to how deeply this value of active permeates, even among the upper classes.

Lewis, 1963: 248–9. Business entrepreneurs and the new middle classes exhibit little sense of social obligations. Professional men see their new status as an avenue to personal advancement.

But this may be regarded as a type of "active" because it is an attempt to improve the position of the self.

The data on the lower classes:

Landy, 1959: 252. "the *mañana* value of the Vallecañeses is reflected in their reliance on the smiles of Fate, in their almost fatalistic acceptance of life as it comes, in their minimal aspirations."

Brown, 1964: 48. "Although a few people assert the impossibility of changing one's destiny, many feel otherwise. To most, the course which one's life follows is the result of personal efforts rather than of forces beyond human control. They firmly reject the concept that some are born to lead and others to follows. In short, the community is not resigned to the fatalistic notion, 'what shall be, shall be.' "

Rogler, 1940: 26. "Resignation, fatalism, and related attitudes that are so prominent in this community, are surely in part the result of this generally low level of health and the all too frequent appearance of death."

It seems clear that the lower class communities vary as to whether they are active or acceptant. The entire lower class cannot be characterized as one or the other.

DOMINANCE—EQUALITY: Power Evaluation

Description:

Dominance	*Equality*
Power over people is a dominant preoccupation in any kind of social interaction.	Power over people is not the main consideration in social interaction.

Criteria:

Dominance	*Equality*
1. Coercion, restriction, and domination follow lines of relative strength, power, or social position of the adversary.	1. Cases of resisting coercion or restriction, regardless of the relative strength, power, or social position of the adversary.
2. People follow only those who are more powerful.	2. People may follow the nonpowerful as well as the powerful.
3. Accumulation and aggrandizement of social power.	3. Unwillingness to take positions that involve power over others.

Ranking: DOMINANCE

I do not have any quotes on this category, but the value on dominance seems very clear. It has two facets, however. On one side, there are the upper classes, and persons who, through their positions, have power over others. These people are very preoccupied with maintaining their power, and in all interaction they demand the proper respect from their subordinates. On the other side are the people without power. These, far from trying to improve their positions and get power, seem to become almost totally dependent.

Brown, 1964: 50. Everyone prefers receiving orders to giving them.

Lewis, 1963: 476. There is an unwillingness to take responsibility, especially in businesses.

There almost seems to be a fear of presuming on the power of a superior. Both the high and the low seem intent on preserving the present power structure.

DOMINANCE—EQUALITY: Attention evaluation

Criteria:

Dominance	*Equality*
1. Instances of exhibitionism, display of self, of attention-attracting activities. Desire to dominate the attention and admiration of others.	1. Exhibitionism and the desire for social prestige is absent or muted.

Ranking: DOMINANCE

To Puerto Rican men life is a continual display of the self. "Machismo" centers around exhibitionism and letting others know how "macho" one is. Even women compete in showing off, but in a far less flagrant manner. Women try to show off through dress, or through having a model family. But in all cases, the individual tries to impress others and gain their approval.

In summing up this appendix, the clear-cut value categories appear to be as follows. Puerto Ricans believe in a determinate (i.e., orderly and consistent) supernatural world. They also believe the social world to be determinate and orderly, though rapid social and economic change, as Mrs. Collier points out, may be affecting this; the growth of new social categories doubtless has produced some ambivalence in values and in behavior. Puerto Ricans regard the supernatural world as not only determinate, but also good. Gods and spirits do not motivate men to do evil, and cannot be readily controlled in order to effect evil results. The social world, however, is by no means taken to be so unexceptionably good. There appears to be considerable doubt that man is "naturally good" and the establishment of social relationships proceeds with the unvoiced expectation that others may trick or exploit one. There appears to be a gap here between what people believe and what they tend to say they believe.

Puerto Ricans are emphatically gregarious. They like (or perhaps better, badly need) the company of fellow men, and appear to regard solitude as bad, and possibly even evidence of badness. Puerto Ricans also stress individuality more than they do the needs or good of the collectivity. This finding may occasion surprise, since much has been said and written of the collectivistic and familistic spirit of the Puerto Rican people. Mrs. Collier finds that individualism (with, of course, very active concern for the needs of one's immediate family) is strong; in the lower classes, this is perhaps less clear. Cooperativeness and group-oriented activity are important and even essential in some lower-class communities, and yet the stress on individual fate seems equally important. Mrs. Collier notes her own reservations about the observers' findings.

A similar lack of clarity marks the self-other category. It seems that Puerto Ricans very much want to create warm interpersonal relationships, and yet greatly fear deception, rejection, and failure in such relationships.

As to autonomy-dependence, the data show that Puerto Ricans are extremely dependent by most ordinary measures. On discipline-fulfillment, the Puerto Rican people seem committed to fulfillment. The active-acceptant value category, like that for determinate-indeterminate (social), seems subject to rapid change in modern Puerto Rico. Mrs. Collier notes that the island possesses individuals or whole groups that are definitely active in their world view—autonomous, impatient, and initiating. Yet the prevailing weight of island values in this regard—especially, perhaps, as revealed in the behavior of lower class folk—is toward acceptance, withdrawal being the most obvious expression of autonomy. One would expect recent changes in island life to affect this characterization somewhat, but there are too few data to prove as much. Brown (1964) and Mintz (1960) offer little to suggest that the change toward activity has been pervasive.

For the dominance-equality (power evaluation) category, Mrs. Collier finds the Puerto Ricans at the dominance end of the scale. She notes, however, that while dominance seems to mark clearly those who have power, dependence marks those who lack it. On dominance-equality (attention evaluation), the Puerto Rican people seem to come out strongly on the dominance side once more. Display to achieve approval seems important for everyone, and suggests that what is approved is subject very much to that of which others approve.

This brief sketch makes clear that the application of the Kluckhohn scale gives only qualified results when applied to Puerto Rico. It does point up some quite firm findings, especially with regard to dependence, gregariousness, and dominance-equality, and it suggests some additional directions in which to search out Puerto Rican values. Since only a part of the available materials on Puerto Rico have been employed in this exercise, it could be readily amplified.

APPENDIX B

This appendix purports to summarize briefly some of the principal books and articles that have dealt, more or less directly, with the theme of Puerto Rican culture. It is written in declarative form, rather than simply as an annotated bibliography, and it is organized under six headings, as follows: 1) community studies; 2) race relations studies; 3) Puerto Rican family structure and attitudes; 4) national culture, national character, national values; 5) studies of change; and 6) summary.

To digest and classify large quantities of disparate data so that they may be read in some orderly and unified fashion is difficult. The classification of particular bits of information can be rather arbitrary, unless one is willing to add on additional new categories along the way. It is rare, moreover, that any two authors write concerning precisely the same thing. Hence each summary tends to be a rather mechanical stringing together of data, not always in satisfactory fashion. Still, it is hoped that some value may be gained from an examination of the different sections of this appendix. In the concluding summary, I make some final comments on "Puerto Rican culture," in the hope that the difficulties in establishing the reality of the national culture will become clearer. The section preceding, on studies of change, mainly suggests our relative ignorance of the cultural derivatives of recent changes in Puerto Rican life.

COMMUNITY STUDIES

One of the first such studies was Charles Rogler's "Comerío" (Rogler, 1940), based on sociological fieldwork carried out in the town of that name in 1935. Comerío is a tobacco-producing valley town in the center of the island; at the time of the Rogler study, it was caught up in the world depression, and its class structure and the rhythm of life reflected as much. Rogler gives an informative picture of town life. In ten chapters, varying from five to 25 pages in length, he discusses economic and racial differences, the local economy, social and political structure, education, religion, and recreation. His text is enriched by numerous direct quotations from informants on a variety of subjects, but he does not contend that the commentators speak for their community, or that the community stands for Puerto Rico. In a concluding chapter five pages long, the author contends that the differences between classes in Comerío "* * * were never great enough to undermine an essential interclass unity. To move from an upper class atmosphere into a lower class atmosphere was not equivalent to moving into a different cultural world" (1940:185).

His findings lead him to assert that the local upper class provided a model or ideal for lower class behavior, and that members of other classes were excluded from equal participation in town life with their class superiors by the exercise of political and economic power. While class differences were more important assortative devices than sexual differences, still the differences between the sexes carry stronger sanctions, "* * * because sex mores are more precise and tend to deal with familiar relations between the sexes, while class differences are more diffused and subject to numerous variations" (1940: 186). As class differences reinforce and underlie the differential social participation of Comerío people in local affairs, so, too, do sex differences restrict women to inferior social positions and limit their participation in wider networks, as compared with the men. The primary cause of women's inferior position in the society seems to the author to rest with "limited economic opportunity," and the basic force behind this state of affairs—its primary sanction—is found in the sex mores: "The inferior position of the woman takes most definite form in the sex mores of decency, chastity, and fidelity" (1940: 187).

Though Rogler does not deal with national values or "typical" attitudes, he does conclude that there is an essential unity and consistency in the life of each Comerío inhabitant. The adjustments to the realities of life that each person must make—

> * * * have been of such a nature as to produce such attitudes as complacency, contentment, and fatalism. "I am contented because I make the best of what I have." These attitudes characterize both the nature of his actions and also the underlying tone of his remarks. Religious values approach from another direction and merge themselves into these attitudes, giving them a more exalted sanction and surrounding them with a supernatural atmosphere (1940: 189).

These concluding remarks are the nearest the author comes to a general approximation of Comerío "values" or "philosophy." The study, though lacking the statistical completeness and somewhat self-conscious methodological rigor of later works, is a very useful introduction to Puerto Rican town life. It is as outdated as the changes since 1935 have made it, but when read today by one who feels some familiarity with Puerto Rican values, it makes clear that in many areas, at least, there is some continuity in Puerto Rican life, apparently in spite of all of the subsequent changes.

In the easy 1940's, the late Morris Siegel, an anthropologist, conducted a brief study of a southwestern Puerto Rican coastal town, Lajas, that has never been published. I have been unable to secure a manuscript copy, and my memory of the study is poor, but several of Siegel's findings bear mention here. Siegel had apparently hoped that his investigations would, at least to some extent, stand for the whole of Puerto Rican town life, and he used his findings to formulate several generalizations he believed to be "typically Puerto Rican." Among these were his formulation of the so-called "virginity cult," which Siegel saw as an aspect of nationally-held values. This "cult" or value was an aspect of the institutionalized inferiority of women, an insistence on their purity as a necessary ingredient of masculine values. Its value-significance was paralleled by the idea of the "macho" or "machismo"—the much-discussed concept of maleness, said to permeate Puerto Rican society, as the logical opposite of the cult of virginity. Because I do not have the manuscript at hand, I will not enlarge on this pair of themes, but they will receive additional consideration later.

"The People of Puerto Rico," edited by Steward (1956), has been referred to so frequently in the body of this report that little will be said of it here. This work deliberately bypassed the idea of national values or beliefs, and concentrated instead on creating a picture of Puerto Rican life built up out of four community studies and a study of the national upper class (see also Manners and Steward, 1953). "The People of Puerto Rico" emphasizes differences based on considerations of economics, regional specialization, and class structure, much more than it does any underlying similarities of value or attitude. While it is concerned with the social history of Puerto Rico, as a backdrop to the quality of island society in 1948–49 (when the fieldwork was executed), the book's treatment of change is inadequate. But the reasons lie more with the rapid change than has typified Puerto Rican life over the past 15 years than with the ethnographers or their theory. My own study of the village called "Cañamelar," for example, entirely fails to take account of the changes which were to occur there within a few years of the completion of fieldwork (see Brameld, 1959: 355–359; Hernández Alvárez, 1964). The book also fails to deal with questions of Puerto Rican "character," or "ethos," in accord with the authors' theoretical reservations about this sort of research direction. Nevertheless, "The People of Puerto Rico" very possibly provides the fullest account of Puerto Rican society ever written. In spite of its many defects, it is based on long fieldwork experiences in many settings, and brings together a wealth of data on Puerto Rico of the time.

Edwin Seda Bonilla, an anthropologist who had worked as a field assistant to the Steward group in 1948–49, subsequently returned to the community he had studied and has published some of his findings (Seda Bonilla: 1963, 1964). His work benefits from the contrast provided by years of change; his concern is very much with such change, and I think it would be fair to say that his view is pessimistic and negative. Like many other observers, Seda Bonilla believes that recent changes have eroded some of the positive values of Puerto Rican culture, leaving young people cynical and uncommitted. I will discuss some of his findings in the section on social and economic change.

David Landy's "Tropical Childhood" (1959), though an anthropological community study in its own right, concentrates on personality, socialization and family structure, and will be dealt with mainly in other sections. Landy worked in a southeastern coastal sugarcane community, less fully proletarianized than Mintz' "Cañamelar," or Padilla Seda's and Seda Bonilla's "Nocorá." Perhaps partly for this reason, and partly because of his concern with the "fit" of culture and personality, his study takes on its primary value with relation to questions of personality and childtraining.

Two short community studies concerned with comparison and change though they give little depth of observation on attitudes and values, deserve mention here. Ríos and Vásquez Calcerrada (1953) and Vásquez Calcerrada (1953) deal with resettled rural communities, in which former "agregados" were able to make a new and more independent start. The Ríos and Vásquez Calcerrada study compares a "successful" with an "unsuccessful" resettlement, with the expectation that the successful community would have higher socioeconomic status, more effective "natural leaders," and a higher degree of community integration. Both communities were in the same region, but one was nearer the original settlement from which the "parceleros" had come. Of the three expectations listed, the second and third were confirmed. An unexpected finding was that those migrants who were closer to their former homes were able to make a more successful adjustment. This study, while interesting, tells us little that is relevant to the objectives of the present report.

Vásquez Calcerrada (1953) has more to say about the shift from "agregado" to "granjero" status, though he does not deal at any length with values or attitudes. The extent to which the resettlers participated in the development of their new community was encouraging. The community had considerable stability until World War II, when many people migrated to the United States in search of better work opportunities. Changes in community life incident to resettlement included a somewhat higher level of consumption, more interest in education, considerable use of modern medical facilities, expanded aspirations, and greater participation in community programs. Underemployment, lack of adequate institutional guidance, and lack of job training continued to create difficulties, and apparently the resettlement itself led to some breakdown in community norms of social control. Religious practices were maintained and even intensified in the resettlement; in fact, an active competition among different faiths attended the establishment of the new community. This study, however, while very informative, again bears only limited relevance to the objectives of this report.

Brown (1964) has completed a study of an impoverished highland farming community near Utuado, which has not been published. His findings suggest considerable disorientation and disillusionment among the people with whom he worked: a rather rigid traditionalism (1964: 43), a feeling of helplessness against poverty (1964: 44), a basic distrust of others (1964: 49), and considerable low-keyed quarreling (1964: 49). At the same time, Brown did not find his informants "fatalistic"—they think of their future and believe in hard work (1964: 48), in spite of their difficult situation. People are sensitive to the opinions of others, even while they are distrustful of them, and are inclined to rely mainly on close kinsmen for help in time of need (1964: 45–49). These and other points made by Brown will be referred to once again in the discussion of national character and values.

These few community studies are not all that have been done by any means, nor have I attempted here to deal with works treating urban neighborhoods and slums. The main studies of rural communities, however, forcibly suggest that there is no particular community that can serve as an exemplar for Puerto Rico as a national society—a point Steward made strongly when his associates began their work on the island in 1948. Community studies are valuable for the general information they offer the reader, but they naturally vary considerably in their usefulness as a basis for generalization, depending upon the skills and particular interests of the fieldworker. In the case of Puerto Rico, the most orderly studies were those of Steward's students (Steward, 1956), but I have suggested that much of their work has been outdated by the vast changes of the past two decades.

Several themes seem to appear with suspicious frequency in the works described so far, and they have to do in particular with men's and women's attitudes. Thus, for instance, most findings stress the status differences between men and women, and the culturally accepted status inferiority of women, accompanied by the so-called machismo complex of men. I will return to a consideration of such data in subsequent sections. Also, I have laid little stress here on statistical data, since there is no easy way to bring the disparate bodies of such data from various monographs into any meaningful relationship.

RACE RELATIONS STUDIES

All of the authors who write on race and race differences conclude that Puerto Ricans are very aware of physical differences. "Negro" features are in general regarded as undesirable while "white" features are prized. But there is no "caste system" as there is in the Southern states, nor is there any belief in the biological inferiority of the Negro. The undesirability of Negro traits is social in origin, and stems from the fact that Negroes were once slaves and, even now, are largely concentrated in the lower classes. There is discrimination against people with markedly Negro traits in Puerto Rico, but the degree of this discrimination varies considerably from situation to situation.

Statistics show clearly that Negroes are concentrated in the lower class, and that there are progressively fewer Negroid features in the population as one goes up the social scale. This does not mean that it is impossible for a black man to reach the top, but there are few who make it. The situation is also complicated by the fact that there are many terms to classify Negroes, and the terminology used will vary from situation to situation. Negroes and mulattoes who reach the middle and upper classes tend to be defined as being whiter than their counterparts in the lower classes. It is also true that the defined Negro population is steadily decreasing as more and more people are being classed as white. Gordon (1949) believes that continuing race prejudice will only serve to hasten the decline of the Negro population because all those who can will want to "pass" as white.

Renzo Sereno, in his article on "cryptomelanism" (1947), states that to a white, a Negro has three drawbacks: (1) He is the result of illegitimate union; (2) he is the descendant of slaves; and (3) he is not presentable to North Americans. To these it may be added that he is usually of lower class origin. Given no other indication of status, Puerto Ricans tend to classify persons with marked Negro traits as lower class and to treat them as such. Part of the discrimination that is directed against Negroes is based on social or class prejudice. Most Puerto Ricans, however, are of mixed ancestry. As people rise in the social scale they tend to try to forget their Negro ancestry; but because most are mixed, they are all vulnerable to attack. Negro can be used against someone, even when that person appears to be "pure white".

The degree of race prejudice and the form that it takes varies from class to class. In the lower class, where there is the largest concentration of Negroid features, there tends to be almost none of what we would call "race prejudice". Instead there is an awareness of color as one aspect of an individual, with Negroid traits being considered undesirable. But Negroid traits can be completely outweighed by other more desirable features, such as a secure economic position, good social standing within the community, etc. And as such, Negroid features are never enough to insure the exclusion of an individual. Instead discrimination takes lesser and more pitiful forms. The child in the family who has the most Negroid features is often the one who is least liked by his parents and most teased by his brothers and sisters. A dark child may not feel free to participate in all of the outside activities of his lighter siblings (Gordon, 1950). Landy (1959) noted that, in the community he studied, the dark girls were the last to be chosen as partners in dances.

The upper class is concerned with "limpieza de sangre" and the perpetuation of special privileges within its own select group. Because of this members tend to exclude any out-group, and Negroes are easily defined in this way because of their obvious physical differences. The upper class maintains select clubs and patronizes the better hotels, which discriminate against Negroes. Even though there are some Negroes who reach high business, professional and political positions, they are still considered to be unacceptable as members of the intimate circles in which the upper class likes to move. These Negroes will be treated as complete equals in business or political encounters among men, but they are never accepted in the home or in intimate social gatherings. An upper class man may marry a mulatto woman without too much censure, but his wife will never be completely accepted and will known that she will be "excused" from many of the functions of the other women of her husband's group. The upper class, however, seems to feel that it is very tolerant, and it actually is, if only because its members do not feel threatened by encroaching Negroes.

The middle class varies tremendously, but probably practices more pure racial discrimination than any other class. (These are the people whom Sereno principally discusses in his article on cryptomelanism). They know that they themselves may have some Negro ancestry, but they try to deny this by forming exclusive "white" clubs to prove to the outside world and themselves that they are indeed what they would like to be. They have adopted the ideal of "sangre limpia" from the upper classes, while knowing that their own ancestry is actually "tainted". They try to make their insecure position more secure by rejecting everything associated with Negroes and by practicing extreme discrimination. Of course, only a segment of the middle class is able to do this; the middle class does contain some Negroes and many mulattoes. These people often cannot pass as white, and are those who suffer from the discriminatory practices of their fellow members of the middle class. But the middle class is a rising class; its members tend to step on all below them, reflecting a sense of extreme competition. Many middle class jobs, such as that of bank clerk are reserved for "white" people, simply to reduce competition.

Contact with continental racial prejudice has probably had its most far-reaching effect in this class as well; the middle class is trying to modernize itself and most of its ideas about what is modern come from the continent. It is not clear just how much racial prejudice must be blamed on ideas from the United States. It has obviously had some effect in that jobs which involve contact with North Americans are often denied to Negroes; but it is also clear that there was prejudice in Puerto Rico before the United States occupation. The rising middle class probably got its racial prejudice from both sources. This is by no means a complete discussion of the middle class, but it is such a complex and diverse group that the dynamics of racial interaction are very incompletely described in the literature (see also Seda Bonilla, 1961; Williams, 1956).

Rogler (1944, 1946, 1948) discusses the fact that Puerto Rico has ideal conditions for race mixing. The double standard insures that at least middle and upper class men will mate with Negro women and produce mixed children, while in the lower class, marriages take place with little regard to color.

Another interesting aspect of race relations in Puerto Rico is the terminology involved. For instance, the term "negrito" is one of endearment, carrying a sense of togetherness, friendship, and mutual trustworthiness—it is almost a "we're in the same boat together" kind of term. "Blanquito," on the other hand, often carries the opposite meaning. When used by a member of the lower class it implies social distance. It also carries the connotation of "uppity" pretentious, and definitely implies the opposite of togetherness and trust. Rogler, however, also notes that it is a term that may be complimentary, insofar as it does imply the desirable traits of whiteness and higher social class.

PUERTO RICAN FAMILY STRUCTURE AND ATTITUDES

The subject is so vast, and the data on it so numerous, that this account is necessarily brief and extremely summary. I have used Mrs. Collier's scheme in the organization of information under several subheadings; for simple reasons of space, I have omitted many corroborative sources and much specific data, as well as nearly all quoted citations.

Courtship

Puerto Rican girls are carefully guarded throughout their childhood, but this guarding becomes more intense as they reach puberty. Soon after puberty, probably around the age of fifteen or sixteen, most girls are considered eligible for marriage. Upper class girls are introduced to society at this age and lower class girls begin to go to dances. All of the opportunities for young people of opposite sexes to meet and get together are carefully supervised; however, even so, there are few opportunities for a boy and a girl even to get to know each other casually. In the lower class girls dance with many boys, but at least one author recorded that they were not supposed to talk together. (See Mintz, 1960, for autobiographical data on courtship, from the male point of view.) It is on such slim meetings as these that the girls "fall in love," but they are not supposed to fall in love too often. In a study of middle and upper class boys and girls at the University of Puerto Rico, Hill (in Fernández Méndez, 1956) found that most reported only having one or two previous "novios," if they had had even that. In any case, the getting-to-know-each other period is very short and the formal "noviazgo" is established quickly.

Noviazgo is not a trial period to see how the couple get along together—it is a formal commitment to marry. Because of this it is hard to break, and all sides lose face when this happens. But in spite of the closeness of a noviazgo, the couple is still never left alone and Stycos (1955) reports that as it continues, the relations between the couple involve more and more "respeto" and not less, at least in the lower classes.

Charles Rosario (1958) has an interesting interpretation of the function of the noviazgo in Puerto Rico that seems to fit the facts better than those anyone else has offered. He says that noviazgo is a period in which the woman learns to submit her will to that of the man. It is not a time for the couple to get to know each other and set up roots for future compatibility; compatibility does not matter. What matters is that the woman learns her role of submission. This seems to tie in with the fact that after marriage there is little communication between husband and wife. The important thing seems to be that each learns to play his role, and the role of the woman is submission. Throughout life the sexes live in different spheres and even in marriage these spheres barely touch.

Noviazgo often lasts quite a while, and involves visits by the boy to the girl's house, where the couple sit and talk together under the supervision of some member of the girl's family. It may also involve occasional outings by the couple, but always accompanied by a chaperone or a group. This chaperonage pattern may be getting weaker, but it seems doubtful that it will disappear altogether within the foreseeable future. Chaperones not only serve to see that the couple behaves properly but they serve the very important function of preserving the girl's reputation. At marriage a girl should be a virgin, not only in fact but in reputation as well. Even when a marriage is consensual, it is usually preceded by some formal period of noviazgo. It is probably rare that a couple simply get together and elope. Though elopement and consensual marriage are the prevalent forms in a community such as Cañamelar, for instance (Mintz, in Steward, 1956), they involve clear-cut formalities, including more or less overt courtship. There are, of course, always exceptions; there are women with looser morals and families that care less about reputation. But both Stycos (1955) and Rogler (1940) were surprised at the extent to which even the lowest classes observed all the rules of the noviazgo and were careful to preserve their girl's reputation, and Mintz (1960) gives additional detail on relevant attitudes.

Husband-Wife Relations

Husbands supposedly have complete authority over their wives and children. The outward semblance of this authority is preserved even when it does not in fact exist. Kathleen Wolf (1952) notes that middle class men whose wives worked outside (and who therefore felt that their authority was threatened) would often make arbitrary demands on their wives just to show that they still had control. The actual degree of control that a man exercises over his family varies a great deal, both from class to class and from region to region. The husband's authority seems to be strongest where the family is poor and where the husband controls all the resources. In these families the wife and children work under his direction and submit completely to his demands. Such families are usually found in those rural regions where tobacco and coffee are farmed (see, for example, Rogler, 1940; Wolf, in Steward, 1956). The husband's authority is great and his wife may be reduced almost to the status of a child. She controls no money and so cannot buy herself anything; she is not allowed outside of the house without his permission; and she is expected to submit to his demands without question. She is the one who cares for the children, but even in this job she exercises as little initiative as is conceivably possible.

The authority structure of the family is somewhat more balanced in regions where people live close together and where women have means of earning at least a little bit of money. In these regions the women are not so completely isolated in their homes, they control some money, and they do some of the family shopping. They may also have a chance to earn money by making things at home to sell, such as sweets. The husband's authority is probably still less in urban areas, where lower class women have a chance to work in factories (see also Mintz, 1965).

In some of these cases the wife's income may support the family or at least contribute a large share of it. The husband also loses his authority to dictate his wife's activities when she works outside the home and has a life and friends of her own. The internal strains in these families, given the ideal of strong male authority, are sometimes great (Wolf, 1952; though see Mintz, 1965).

Middle and upper class husbands exercise more authority in their homes than do American husbands, but they do not have the complete control that some lower class men do. In many of the middle class families the women have fewer children and work outside the home. Even if the women do not work, they still have more freedom, as they are not so tied down by childrearing. The middle and upper classes are also beginning to adopt the American idea that children are a woman's job, and husbands are beginning to let their wives make more and more of the decisions concerning the children and how they should be brought up. Along with this goes the attitude that homemaking is a woman's job and that the women should therefore do all the family shopping. In relinquishing the control of money and of the children, middle and upper class men have come a long way from the extremely authoritarian families discussed above. The women have to tread the delicate line between submission to their husbands and exercising their own initiative in running their homes and families.

Almost all of the authors who write on the Puerto Rican family stress the lack of communication between husbands and wives. This lack is really quite understandable, given the childrearing patterns. From babyhood on, boys and girls are kept separate and each is taught to associate only with members of his own sex. Boys and girls share no common activities, and when they finally come together in courtship, the roles played by each are very different. Marriage merely continues the pattern. Husbands and wives each have their own roles and in very traditional families there is no need for communication between them. They share few common activities, and so there is almost nothing to be discussed. When decisions have to be made, the husband dictates and the wife submits. Such a family is, of course, extremely inflexible. It is unable to adapt very well to changing conditions. Because conditions are changing and have changed a great deal in Puerto Rico, it must be surmised that some changes have taken place in the family to make communication (and, therefore, greater flexibility) possible. No author really discusses the extent of these changes in descriptive sociological terms, and so it is difficult to tell just what has been taking place. Probably lower class families in backward areas have maintained more of the old and inflexible patterns (Brown, 1964), while in areas where change has been more drastic or where increased income has raised a family's status, there is now considerably more communication between husbands and wives (Mintz, 1965). But in any case, because of the separation of the sexes, the chances are that communication between spouses will remain at a relatively low level.

Landy especially discusses the power of women in his book "Tropical Childhood" (1959). He notes the inconsistency that, in a culture where the men are supposed to be absolute rulers of their homes, it is the women who are brought up to be stable and responsible. Women supposedly look for stability in marriage and the ideal is to get a man who is "serio" and responsible. But Landy says that such men rarely exist because men are brought up to be insecure and unstable. The women are therefore the anchors of their families and carry a large share of responsibility for the orderly running of society. Women exercise most of their power over their children (Wolf, 1952). There is an extremely strong feeling that a woman should not abandon her children. Fathers may leave, but mothers may not. The children derive their feeling of security from their mothers. In most cases the children are extremely dependent on their mothers, and boys may retain this dependency long after they have become men (Wolf, 1952; Mintz, 1965). But even in cases where men profess dependence on, and love for, their mothers, it is the daughters who end up caring for their old mother. This small area of power that belongs to women is, however, very slight when one compares it to all of the male privileges. Women may be responsible and more secure, but they are decidedly underprivileged. Women—and their roles—are regarded as inferior.

Women are supposed to be virgins when they marry and to remain chaste afterwards. Actually the women use their virginity as a lever against the men. A man who marries a woman and deprives her of her virginity owes her support and reasonable treatment for the rest of her life. The woman, in return, however, must show absolute fidelity in reputation as well as in deed. She cannot do anything which might even hint of infidelity, such as talking with a man who is not her husband. Women are not trusted around men at all. This is understandable, given the fact that women are not brought up to take care of themselves. They are taught to submit to men, and to rely for protection on their fathers, brothers, and later, husbands. It is presumed, and with some accuracy, that if given the chance a woman will fall. This puts a real strain on marital relations. The man can never be completely sure of his wife because he is away all day and he cannot check up on her every moment. The woman, on the other hand, must be extremely careful not to do anything which might arouse her husband's suspicions. The men seem to be the ones who suffer the most, though, because to be cuckolded is to have one's reputation almost completely ruined.

Childrearing

Childrearing patterns vary a great deal from class to class and probably from region to region, but there do seem to be some constants. In all classes obedience and "respeto" are the most prized qualities in children. Brameld (1959) cites a male informant who says that children under 10 should "fear," from 10 to 20, they should "respect," and over 20, they should "love" their parents. (Needless to add, the discontinuities in a socialization ideal of this sort are severe.) Love for parents is only secondary. In all classes the sexes are strictly separated. Little girls are kept clothed, are kept nearer home and under closer supervision, and are expected to be more submissive. Little boys are encouraged to be independent and aggressive within certain limits, and are allowed to go about without clothing, at least in the lower class. Boys are not so closely guarded, and in towns are allowed to roam the streets. In all classes children are kept dependent on their parents for quite some time. In the lower class this is fostered by the mother's neglect of the child, who therefore longs for attention; and in the upper class it is often fostered by the fact that the child is overpetted and cared for. In all classes, it also seems that aggression is strongly suppressed. Little boys are encouraged to show aggression in such situations as temper tantrums (Mintz, in Steward, 1956), but are not allowed to direct it against another human. Landy (1959) noted that in his village, children who were involved in a fight were punished no matter whose fault the fight was. Another constant might be that small children are universally loved and enjoyed. Not much is expected of them during the first 2 years and they are the petted playthings of adults. After they begin to talk, however, they are subject to demands for obedience and "respeto."

The lives of upper class children are not at all well described in the literature, but from what little there is it seems that such children are petted and pampered by adults for at least their early years. They have servants to wait on them constantly and are not taught to feed themselves or to do anything. They learn that the way to have their desires met is to order someone to do something, rather than do it themselves (Wolf, 1952). These children also come to see a strict dichotomy in their lives. When they are clean and well behaved they are admitted to the company of their parents and members of their parents' class. When they are dirty or ill behaved they are sent back to the servants. Sereno (1947) suggests that this causes little boys to associate sex with lower class women and "pure" love with their mothers and with women of their own class. When they marry, they allegedly have difficulty establishing adequate sexual relations with their wives.

Lower class childrearing is much better documented, but even there, the variation is notable. In isolated rural areas, children are kept at home and often see only brothers and sisters. Even in areas where families live relatively close together children may be kept isolated by parents who are afraid that their children's behavior might cause them shame (Landy, 1959). In some urban areas, on the other hand, the children run the streets day and night. The little girls are kept somewhat more confined, but they are still in the streets when they can get there. Lower class children are often part of large families and get little care and attention from their parents. The mother of a large family if often too busy to be able to do anything more than just provide food and clothing and a minimum of supervision for her children. In these families corporal punishment is frequent and forms the main means of ensuring obedience in the children. In fact, in some areas, punishment is regarded as a sign of love and the child who is unbeaten is regarded with pity because he is considered to be unloved.

Stycos (1955: 38–39) discusses what his informants listed as the main duties of children toward their parents, and of parents toward their children. Just as children should show obedience and respeto to their parents and love is only secondary, so the parents' main duty is to provide materially for the child, with love again being a minor consideration. Stycos also noted the mother's duty never to abandon her children. Fathers should provide material benefits, while mothers should be around to take care of everyday needs, and for protection. In the lower class families that Stycos studied, the father was always the supreme authority, while the mother was the day-to-day supervisor. Any decision or punishment she carried out, however, was always done in the father's name. Children were found to feel invariably closer to their mothers than to their fathers. The social distance between a man and his children was extreme. It was almost impossible for either to bridge the gap. Fathers were the recipients of fear and respeto but rarely of love.

Landy's entire book was about childrearing, but a few items seem especially interesting. Landy says that children are rarely rewarded for good behavior (1959: 123). Parents believe that if a child is rewarded too often he will lose his respeto for his parents. This ties in with an observation by Seda Bonilla (1964) that parents do not believe in letting their children argue with them because they will lose their "respeto." There seems to be a fear on the part of parents that children will lose their feelings of respect. (But as a part of the normal process of growing up, children have to cut their parents down to size. Children cannot go on forever seeing them as the omnipotent beings that they were during early childhood. One wonders if this normal process of growing up causes real strains in the Puerto Rican family.) Landy also notes in his book that there is very little demand for children to achieve in the community that he studied (1959: 150). Landy concluded with the same observations that others had made—that it is much easier for girls to fill the role expected of them than for boys. Girls only have to be submissive and obedient. Boys, on the other hand, are expected to be obedient and show respeto for their parents, while at the same time being independent and aggressive.

NATIONAL CULTURE, NATIONAL CHARACTER, NATIONAL VALUES

This is perhaps the hardest category of all to summarize usefully. Since I have taken the position that it is very difficult to speak of a common Puerto Rican culture or identity in the body of the report, I feel it essential to sum up what others have said in favor of the existence of some national character structure or value system. The difficulty lies not only with the relative abstractness of the concepts, but also with the many different viewpoints from which the problem has been approached. (I can say parenthetically that, if I had been able to summarize such materials to my total satisfaction at some earlier time, I would have published an article on this subject many years ago.)

Simple lists of traits may be mentioned first, though I have indicated my reserve about them. Reuter (1946) emphasizes the nonsecular and relativistic point of view of Puerto Ricans; the way class sentiments survived in the face of North American preconceptions that political democracy would break down such sentiments; the Puerto Rican predilection for dreams, unrealistic plans, and illusions, and the dependency of attitude of the islanders. I believe his view is ethnocentric and anachronistic.

A far better and more sophisticated enumeration is provided by Saavedra de Roca (1963), who used published sources to document each point. Since it serves no purpose to repeat her presentation wholly, I will simply list here the "prevailing values" in her paper, some of which will be discussed more analytically at a later point in this section. "Dignidad" refers to some powerful inner value concerned with maintaining one's public image or viewed status. It is seen as both a positive value and as a negative one—Cochran (1959) equates it with "sense of integrity", while Tugwell (in Fernández Méndez, 1956) feels it may be employed to conceal incompetence, and to substitute fantasy-renderings for the reality of the self. Tumin (1958) stresses dignidad as the source of pride in work, and, with Gillin (1955), sees it as giving a man of any social and economic status the capacity to feel his worth regardless of his worldly success or failure. Individualism is another "prevailing value" of the Puerto Rican, and numerous writers (e.g., Gillin, 1955; Schurz, 1949) see this trait as generally Latin American. This inner quality—be it called soul, or "alma," or "ánima"—is unrelated to the external world. "Whereas the effort of each man on the mainland to be 'as good as the next person' inevitably produced a competitive type of individualism, the possession of a 'unique inner quality' is quite divorced from external contests" (Cochran, 1959: 123).

Again, personalism or "personalismo" is seen as distinctively Puerto Rican. At least in contrast to the United States. Wells (1955) makes much of personalismo in explaining the special quality of Puerto Rican politics, in particular the emotionally charged adoration of Luis Muñoz Marín. Because of personalism, Cochran (1959: 125–26) tells us, the unification of small businesses into larger entities, the development of nonfamilial commercial ties, the maintenance of a high efficiency in committee work, etc., are hampered. Personalism in effect requires that all social, economic, and political relationships proceed on a basis of known face-to-face contact.

The value put on education is another characteristic of the Puerto Ricans. Tumin (1958), in his study, confirms the findings of Steward's associates (1956) and of Hill, Stycos, and Back (1959), that the desire for education in Puerto Rico burns brightly. Education is both the best marker of class differentiation (Tumin, 1958: 464–66), and the "most effective point of leverage in the total social system."

Family values, especially patterns of familial authority, form another category of the Puerto Rican value system. Saavedra de Roca does little with this theme, except to suggest that class differences are accompanied by differences in paternal authority, using Wolf (1952), Tumin (1958), and Mintz and Padilla Seda (in Steward, 1956) as her sources.

Other familial values discussed by Saavedra de Roca include respect for parents, parental obligations to the children, the position of women, communication between spouses, attitudes toward ideal family size, courtship attitudes, machismo, the woman's role in socialization separation of the sexes, bodily cleanliness, sibling rivalry and cooperation, parental conceptions of childhood, bodily punishment, inconsistencies in socialization, responsibility and dependency. I do not plan to examine these subjects fully here; a number of them are touched upon elsewhere, particularly in the discussion of family structure.

Finally, Saavedra de Roca makes reference to "optimismo" (i.e., as an attitude toward life), which was strongly identified by Tumin (1958: 166), to some extent in contrast to the findings of others. Parenthetically, I would say to this last that the "fatalism" of Puerto Ricans simply made more sense in terms of the realities of 1935 or 1940 than in 1950 or 1960. It would be difficult to contend, for instance, that average North American attitudes in 1935 were not significantly different in this regard from what they would become in 1945 or 1950. Though the Saavedra de Roca article does not employ all of the available relevant sources by any means, though it lacks a historical perspective, and though it gives little on the dynamics of behavior behind these various values or attitudes, it is a very useful preliminary staking-out of areas in which many observers have found common ground in studying the Puerto Rican people.

Figueroa Mercado (1963) covers some of the same ground as Saavedra de Roca, but puts her emphasis more firmly on culture and personality. She attempts to give historical "origins" for various attitudes—for example, hospitality and generosity are Indian and Spanish in origin, uncertainty ("incertidumbre") and fatalism derive from the disaster-prone and dependent status of Puerto Rico, and so on—but such attributions are not completely convincing. The island is caught up in a spiritual vassalage ("vasallaje espiritual") that Puerto Ricans must examine if they are to free themselves from it. Individual and group insecurity, the hope for miraculous good fortune, the unwillingness to make firm decisions, and other traits have been synthesized by those outsiders who, not understanding the Puerto Rican collective soul, see the phrase "¡A bendito!" as a symbol of the irresolute Puerto Rican personality. The Figueroa Mercado article shares much, it seems to me, with the position taken by Pedreira in his "Insularismo"; it is a good essay, and a moving one. Not surprisingly, however, it only admits that many changes have occurred since Puerto Rico fell into North American hands, and it does not deal at all with what those changes have meant for "the collective soul" of the Puerto Rican people.

These papers are more than simple trait-lists, but they provide only limited access to any analysis of Puerto Rican character. They go along with such works as Pedreira's "Insularismo" (though lacking its depths, reflectiveness, and charm), René Marqués' "El puertorriqueño docil," and other humanistic approaches to Puerto Rican culture. To some extent "belles-lettres" provide similar insights. As one illustration, César Andreu's "Los Derrotados" (which deals with a vain nationalist attempt to assassinate an American Army officer) provides a view of Puerto Rican society that is less than pure fantasy, and in some ways much more than pure social science. The class structure of island society is depicted through the book's characters, and the differences in attitude and ideology of the protagonists throw real light on island life. Only two "intellectuals" grace the book's pages. Though reputable and intelligent, these men are shown as empty, or hollow, because they could not be true to their own insights. Fully realizing the need for ideals and for honor (perhaps an aspect of machismo in this rendering), they simply could not follow the course they believed to be right. The working people in the book are factory proletarians, and poor fishermen and country folk. They fall into two categories—the honest but simple people who do the best they can with what they have (thus embodying dignidad), and the misguided sheep who depend on their class betters as moral guides and get their precepts from the radio. These latter lose their simple peasant culture in a grinding modernization process that gives them nothing better to enhance their lives. Finally, there are members of the middle class and they, too, fall into two categories. Those who choose a nationalist political direction retain their honor, their high ideals, and their status as machos. But the political imperatives deprive them of normal lives, and isolate them from their wives and children; their conflict inheres in the attractiveness of a life that insists on no responsibility except to political principles. The other middle class figures choose to follow North American ideals;

moneymaking becomes the be-all and end-all of their lives. They become effeminate as their women become mannish, and their activities make them dishonest and vulgar. Yet they get access to real political power, control money and resources, and thus gain control over others. The climax of the novel emphasizes that—if, indeed, this is the way things are—the thinking man and the principled man have no way out in Puerto Rican society. Obviously, this is a novel, not a sociological tract. But it would be unfair to claim simply that Andreau has given us a picture of what he thinks—much in this book rings true, and articulates real problems in contemporary Puerto Rico. It would be interesting to make comparable sketches of other literary works of this kind, but the rewards are probably tangential to the aims of the appendix.

In the body of the report, I suggested that four sorts of inquiry may give some answers to the question of Puerto Rican identity or national culture: social history, value categories, socialization and child-training patterns, and "social idioms." Something may be said now of each of these categories. Within the category of social history, one thinks of the work of Steward and his associates, the paper by Figueroa de Mercado, and Petrullo's book as examples. Such features of Puerto Rican life as the complex but essentially noncolor-based handling of race differences, the mandatory hospitality, the often illusory hopes for an economic windfall, the attitudes of dependency (especially in the political sphere), the acceptance of rigid class differences, etc., may be traced—though not with conspicuous success, I fear—to Puerto Rico's special history.

Investigations of value systems and reflections on commonly acknowledged values suggest a different direction. Pedreira's book deserves first mention. Some of the papers cited earlier (e.g., Saavedra de Roca) seek greater specificity within the same sphere. Brameld (1959), in an interesting book concerned particularly with the relationship between Puerto Rican culture and education, also makes some attempt to identify a single value system for the Puerto Rican people. He includes in his list of values "* * * the familiar cluster denoted by such terms as friendliness, outreachingness, kindness, sharing, hospitality, brotherliness, and gregariousness. Others that were underscored include devotion to family, personal pride, honesty in government, racial egalitarianism, respect for learning, loyalty to the homeland without fanatical nationalism (the value called nonnationalism), an accent upon being rather than becoming, and love of the Spanish language" (1959: 267). In eliciting responses, Brameld was unable to get clear opinions as to whether Puerto Ricans value esthetic matters above scientific ones, or vice versa; nor was it clear whether cooperation or competition was more important as a typical value of the "average" man (or even whether people felt cooperation was now gaining, at the expense of a more competitive attitude). The difficulties here may lie with the unspecificity of the subject, of course—these are hard things to discuss in the abstract. Brameld did locate two significant areas suggestive of widely held values. His informants largely supported the notion that Puerto Ricans are "* * * relativistic in the sense that they are exceptionally tolerant of attitudes and practices different from their own. Despite the volatility attributed to their modal personalities, they were said to abhor violence of a mass variety; hence they would much rather acculturate and even assimilate foreign values and accompanying practices than militantly resist them" (Brameld, 1959: 271). The author goes on to add:

> Compared with several other Latin American countries, such as Cuba again, it is even possible to say that this "elasticity of accommodation" becomes a value distinctive in several ways—in a lack of chauvinistic quarrelsomeness; in the centuries-old evolutionary rather than revolutionary approach to cultural goals; in the friendly curiosity with which people listen to while seldom challenging outsiders; in a "purposeful patience"; in respect for the democratic voting process as a slow but sure way of achieving such goals; in the comparative success with which migrants accommodate themselves to a new cultural environment; and in the high regard attached to cultural change (Brameld, 1959: 271).

Another attempt at enumerating values, or at getting at some value system, is that employed by Mrs. Collier in the other appendix to this report. Here, written materials were examined to extract data confirming one or another position in the Kluckhohn values scheme. Firm answers could be given in only several categories; for many the data were either contradictory, dealt with different class groupings, or represented different points in time.

Studies of socialization and child training bulk importantly in the social science literature on Puerto Rico. Outstanding, I believe, is the paper by K. Wolf (1952), the book by Landy (1959), and some of the materials provided by Steward's associates. Other important data come from the many studies primarily concerned with birth control and attitudes toward family size. The difficulties implicit in employing socialization data in order to get at what might be called national character or a national personality are serious. Among other things, it is often very hard to establish any wholly convincing linkage between child training and the adult personality, even when these seem to go together. However, at least something should be said of this, in further elaboration of the data given elsewhere.

According to Landy (1959: 99, 120), Puerto Rican parents see children as completely dependent, and also believe that they have a ready predisposition to be "bad." Little boys are born with "malicias" (perhaps "malice," but more likely "shrewdness" or "guile"); girls, though born innocent, are easily corrupted. Obedience is demanded from children, and secured. Conformity is deemed more important than achievement; for instance, in spite of the many references to high values on education, Landy's informants were not overly concerned with keeping children in school (1959: 150–51). Boy and girl children receive differential treatment and training, starting at an early age. Wolf (1952: 410–11) points out how, in the rural highland community of Manicaboa, boys are encouraged toward physical autonomy and movement out of and away from the house, while girls are guarded and protected. Boys continue to go naked much longer than girls, who are clothed almost from the first. At the same time the demands put upon children are much more consistent in the case of girls than of boys; there is generally more for girls to do that needs doing, and success at tasks is an important part of growing up. For boys, the work to be done diminishes in some communities, so that adolescent males may have difficulties in attaching their physical maturation to any worthwhile service to the family. It is not surprising, perhaps, that a 15-year-old girl is ready for marriage while a boy of this age is still seemingly much younger.

Since sexuality seems to be regarded as both inherent and not inherently bad, the separation of boy and girl children, the clear demarcation of male and female tasks, and the strict chaperonage of adolescence, work together in shaping the adult male or female personality. Men cannot control their sexual impulses except through the presence of others, if one is to judge by the way socializing between boys and girls goes on. Girls should not have to resist sexual advances, but should rather have the protection afforded by the chaperone. The lesson seems to be that women are incapable of defending themselves against male sexual aggression, while men are incapable of internally imposed self-discipline. It needs to be understood that such assertions are inferences, rather than clearly stated beliefs or values, and further, that they can hardly be claimed to hold for each and every Puerto Rican.

Much more could be said of child training and socialization, but for reasons of space, I will turn instead to the supposed adult personality derivatives of these and other child training practices. Landy (1959: 168) claims that the Puerto Rican child-training experience leads to an insatiable adult need for intimate social relationships with others. Relations "de confianza" are desired, yet the demands of truly trustful closeness are overpowering, and men are constantly frustrated. Grownups have a "defense," even apprehensive outlook, suggesting that they find their environment hostile and menacing (Landy, 1959: 78). Expressions of salutation response ("Siempre en la lucha," "Ahí luchando," "Siempre defendiéndome," etc.) accompany this alleged attitude. People count heavily on the opinions of others in maintaining their self-images. Landy writes (1959: 194) "The fragile sense of community solidarity, the lack of a strong sense of communal responsibility and duty, and, conversely, a highly developed sense of familism (now somewhat tattered and strained) and individualism in terms of face and dignidad rather than ego-ideals and ego-aspirations" make for a weak superego—and no doubt for considerable dependence on outside opinion. Brown (1964: 56–58) gives a view of men in the rural and impoverished community he studies that builds on these earlier contentions. Here, men value machismo as they do elsewhere in Puerto Rican society. "Defending oneself," gambling, cockfighting, drinking heavily, having many women, and being a "good sport" are all positively valued. Women seek to deflect their sons from these ideals, and mothers are extremely important in perpetuating the curious childish quality of adult manhood imputed to Puerto Ricans; but women, due to their low social and economic status, are unable to keep their sons away from the male view of the world. Such ideals are trenchantly analized by Wolf (1952), and her contrast of three different community settings suggests that many such values are differently held, and have different symbolic connotations in different class and community groups. Brameld (1959: 192 et seq.) has attempted to synthesize some of these value attributions to adult Puerto Ricans in search of a "modal personality" or "basic personality," but with inconclusive results. The "defensiveness" of the Puerto Rican stands out as an imputed trait or character; it is displayed in guarding oneself against those of higher prestige or more powerful status; in not opposing persons of authority, even when they are regarded with doubt or suspicion; in getting one's way by patient and subtle "killing" of an opposite view, rather than by an open fight; and by the presence of its temperamental opposite, aggressiveness. This aggressiveness may be expressed in self-destructiveness (including suicide), in explosive anger, in homicidal violence (murder viewed as an end point of an adult "tantrum"), and in some features of machismo.

I must admit that I find it difficult to accept any of these statements as describing with total accuracy what is "characteristically Puerto Rican," and few writers on Puerto Rican behavior are so unreserved as to claim this. In a qualified but insightful paper, Albizu and Marty (1958) have attempted to use projective test materials (including Rorschach, modified TAT, and sentence completion tests) to derive a self-image sketch of the personality of lower class Puerto Ricans. Two groups, one in Puerto Rico and another in Chicago, were used as subjects, and the techniques used differed, yet the results show surprising uniformity. The tests revealed much that could be inferred negatively about the personalities of the subjects: A sense of inferiority to non-Puerto Ricans, a lack of resourcefulness and initiative, and a noticeable passivity, among other things. These authors, like many others, emphasize the dependency of the Puerto Rican people, their inability to confront crisis head on, their employment of resignation ("ay bendito") and circumventive aggression ("pelea monga") in seeking solutions, and their docility. Though the results certainly raise doubts and many questions, they are of special interest since they are supposed to originate in the self-perceptions of the subjects, rather than in the observations of naive outsiders.

Numerous other studies might be mentioned in this section, but the materials are too diverse to afford us any unified picture. I wish now to discuss only the notion of "social idiom" as an approach to the study of national character, and to add a final list of traits, before ending this section. Throughout my report I have carefully qualified all judgments about the unity of Puerto Rican culture by emphasizing that culture is a historical product, and is rarely shared (and certainly not, in Puerto Rico's case) by all members of the society. Instead, culture is differentially carried by individual Puerto Ricans, and its symbolic meanings are doubtless differentiated as well. At the same time, I have suggested that the concept of "social idiom" may well provide one of the more fruitful directions for getting at some nationwide value system or "style" that might justifiably be regarded as typically or even uniquely Puerto Rican. The concept rests on the known need for members of different social groups within a single society to interact meaningfully with each other. To do so, they must present images of themselves that are consistent with the social usages and expectations of others. The relational process—or more simply put, the way people carry on behavior in emotionally and symbolically comprehensible ways—requires some basic conventional understanding; Wolf (1956b: 1075), Seda Bonilla (1957), and others have explored this process usefully, and Lauria (1964) has sought to apply his analysis to one aspect of Puerto Rican social relations. His paper begins with a consideration of the concept of "respeto," and he admits at the outset that the values implied by the term, as well as the term itself, are clichés. It is, he contends, precisely because they are clichés that they say something true and analytically important about Puerto Rican character. Terms such as "homebre de respeto, falta de respeto, hay que darse a respetar antes de ser respetado, hombre de confianza, hombre prócerto, sinvergüenza, de carácter," and many others fall within the area that defines respeto and its opposite, and it is possible to explore this sphere of definition by getting descriptions of acts and feelings from informants. The overfamiliarity of the terminology no more obviates careful analysis than would be true of comparable terminology in the language of another culture. Thus, for instance, in American English, we use such terms as "shame," "self-respect," "no self-respecting person would * * *" "shameless," "conscienceless," "to feel guilty," "to feel small," to be "shown up," to "put up or shut up," "to back down," etc.—and the familiarity of such terms by no means invalidates their usefulness for understanding the characteristic tones of American social life. Lauria contends that, in the Puerto Rican case, proper understanding of such terms and their meanings is typical of the entire society, and not of a single segment of it. Such terms as are understood throughout the society prove their relevance to the social totality because they are clichés, and because they are understood by everyone; they mark the areas in which ready communication among people of different social status require considerable common understanding.

Lauria's exposition deals primarily with two such clusters, "respeto" and "relajo"; he establishes to my satisfaction that these terminologies lie close to the heart of Puerto Rican culture and identity, and give evidence that such identity is a reality. I feel a certain difficulty myself in dealing with these materials though I believe they are extremely insightful and provocative. It seems to me that the terms and their meanings suggest rather more about personality than they do about culture—though I am prepared to admit that they represent aspects of learned social behavior, and not simply "character structure." I also find it difficult to see how such materials can be transformed into a picture of a national culture—something presumably unique, and on a total societal scale. However, I believe the promise of this research is great. Lauria is now working on problems of "social types," with the hope of characterizing Puerto Rican (or Hispanic-Latin American) "social personalities." What is most interesting about the concepts, it seems, is the way they permit one's transcending such basic sociological considerations as differences in class, sex, age, and social status. I believe it is indeed true that, on such values as respeto and its meaning, the Puerto Rican worker and Puerto Rican banker probably share much of their understanding. This is, however, a long way from any satisfactory depiction of Puerto Rican nationhood, and pioneers such as Seda Bonilla and Lauria are well aware of it.

In her work for me, Mrs. Collier attempted at one point to summarize briefly her impressions of the features of Puerto Rican life that figured most importantly in her reading. I have added a bit to her list, but it is admittedly an impressionistic and untested formulation; I include it here for what it may be worth. It should be remembered that these various items are not regarded by Mrs. Collier or by myself as of equal weight or in any sense "proved."

(1) Puerto Rico is not only Spanish-speaking, but bids fair to remain so for as long as one can predict. The Spanish language, while it has different values, no doubt, to members of different groups, is commonly approved of and preferred by nearly everyone. Much of the sentimental speciality of feeling of the Puerto Rican people about themselves and about the island rests in linguistic considerations.

(2) Puerto Rico is a Catholic country; but it is not just any Catholic country, it is Puerto Rico. Puerto Rican Catholicism is much differentiated in class and other terms, and other religions—particularly the nonecumenical Protestant sects—have grown rapidly at the cost of a formal but sometimes empty rural Catholicism. All the same, many of what appear to be widely held or basic values in Puerto Rican life flow from the Catholic spirit; being a "bad" Catholic (consensual marriage, not attending church, not going to confession, etc.) does not signify an absence of Catholicism, but occurs within the context of the presence of Catholicism. The concept of a supernatural order; the belief that objects may possess supernatural powers; the division (implicit, to be sure) of women into "Marys" and "Eves"; the veneration of Mary and of motherhood; the confirmed use of external sanctions to atone for sins (penance), and of external social devices to control, prevent, and punish behavior; the double sexual standard; the much-used institution of compadrazgo—these, and much else, suggest the underlying power of a Catholic ideology which, in Puerto Rico's case, is less expressed as an aspect of religiosity than as an aspect of national character.

(3) Puerto Ricans continue to accept the idea of a class-structured society in which those with less power and authority owe agreed-upon acts, and attitudes of deference and respect, to others more powerful than they. It is perfectly true that this may well be changing rapidly in Puerto Rico; nevertheless it bears noting that the child-training patterns in many class groupings, and the institutionalized inferiority of women, are behavioral complexes that are probably consistent with this idea of a world ordered into superordinate and subordinate sectors. I will not attempt to substantiate this assertion anecdotally or at length, but examples are very easy to come by (Seda Bonilla, 1957, 1963, 1964; Brown, 1964; Rogler, 1940; Wolf in Steward, 1956; Mintz, 1960; Albizu and Marty, 1958; etc.).

(4) Typically Puerto Rican is the particular complex of attitudes delineated by Gillin (1955) for Latin America, and applied by Brameld (1959) and Cochran (1959) to Puerto Rico: (*a*) A special image of "the individual"; (*b*) the acceptance of a stratified social hierarchy (see above); and (*c*) a transcendental or idealistic view of the world. We have seen that "individualism" signifies here a notion of worth and uniqueness unrelated to the outer world or to worldly success.

The idea of the world as a fixed social hierarchy has been raised in the preceding paragraph, and needs no further discussion. As to Gillin's third generalization, it is interesting to note that Steward, though chary of characterological generalization, does write of the Puerto Ricans that (1956: 11) they share "* * * emphasis upon spiritual and human rather than commercial values; interest in poetry, literature and philosophy rather than science and industry; and emphasis on interpersonal relations rather than a competitive individualism." He makes clear at the same time that such dispositions are probably not equally shared by any means by all Puerto Ricans.

(5) The concept of dignidad, and the related concepts of honor, "respeto, confianza," etc., and their polar opposites, communicated in such terms as "relajón, sinvergüenza," etc. Since I have referred to this material earlier, I will say not more of it here.

(6) The need for interaction in order to define the self. Privacy is neither valued nor desired; the opinions of others seem to weigh more than any internalized abstract code of behavior; dignidad, respeto, confianza, etc., are defined with reference to others. Accordingly, outside sanctions are required to define individual behavior; chaperonage and the overuse of the terms vergüenza and sinvergüenza, are indicators of the powerful ways that outside sanctions function. There is fear of people who are sensitive to outside opinion, and therefore of "sinvergüenzas" fear as well of uncontrolled aggression, and some contradiction between attitudes toward aggression and attitudes toward ideal maleness (machismo).

(7) The double sexual standard. North Americans are hardly in a position to throw stones—but it would be a gross error to suppose that the North American double standard, and that allegedly typical of Puerto Rico, operate in identical or even roughly similar ways. Especially important is the way the double standard concedes no real autonomy to either sex—chaperonage operates as if no man were capable of controlling himself, and as if no woman were really able to say "no." At the same time, it should be noted that the underlying assumption here may make for relatively straightforward and satisfactory sexual relations in marriage. (The ethnographic data, unfortunately, do not confirm such an optimistic inference.)

(8) Together with the double sexual standard, there appears to be a strong belief in the natural inferiority of women—they have five senses compared to man's seven, they are weaker physically, they are more emotional and cannot reason, and they are assumed to have a radically different personality structure I need hardly add that I am unconvinced that this view is held with equal fondness by members of all social groups, or by members of both sexes.

(9) The cult of virginity, which goes along with the points made

above, and conceivably still affects powerfully the quality of social relationships in Puerto Rico.

(10) Consonant with this is the relative lack of communication between the sexes, and their strict separation throughout life. As in other ways—such as the belief in a rigid social hierarchy, with clear obligations of deference—I believe this aspect of Puerto Rican life is changing rapidly.

(11) Machismo, as a complex of attitudes and values having to do with maleness and male dignidad, and logically counterposed to the points made above. Though machismo as a term has been much used, it has received nowhere the serious analytic and qualifying attention it deserves. Mrs. Collier points out, for instance, that machismo is hinged more to the opinions of a man's peer group than to his inner sense of confident maleness, but much more needs to be done with this idea.

(12) Dependency, as an aspect of social life. Often claimed as a central feature of the Puerto Rican character (see, for instance, Pedreira, 1946; Albizu and Marty, 1958), too little has been done to relate the concept to concrete details of behavior.

To this list might be added, quite provisionally, the emphasis on personal cleanliness as opposed to much lesser concern with the physical environment; an "undeveloped" aesthetic sense; difficulty in deferring gratification; the relativistic tolerance of cultural difference; the unwillingness to rationalize the pleasurable as primarily practical (in contrast to the North American); the reluctance to see guilt as a preferable moral force to shame; and much else.

In concluding, I think it important to emphasize yet again that the kind of view of "the Puerto Rican" or "the Puerto Rican people" provided by arguments of this sort is not one to which I am personally very sympathetic. Though this sketch is brief, I have tried to state the case for such characterizations as fairly as I can. My reservations, once again, inhere in the difficulty, first of all, of proving such assertions; and secondly, in my feeling that class differences and rapid social change both conspire to invalidate these kinds of generalizations almost as soon as they are set forth.

STUDIES OF CHANGE

It may seem paradoxical that so little has been written on social change in Puerto Rico, when few societies seem to be changing so rapidly, or to be receiving so much social scientific attention. Tumin and Feldman (1961) take what may be fairly called an optimistic view of social change in Puerto Rico. Their study, based on questionnaire materials, indicates that Puerto Ricans share a universal desire to educate their children (1961: 123); that people see their society as open because they aspire more for their children than for themselves (1961: 143); that morale is high, and that people do not see present inequalities as insuperable (1961: 164); that those who see their children in the same social class as themselves are culturally conservative (1961: 201); and so on. In fact, there are several methodological difficulties here (not the least, perhaps, being that which dogs all questionnaire studies—the problem of reliability and of comprehension); among them, the disposition to treat informants from the various subcultures of Puerto Rico as if there were no subcultural differences seems particularly shortsighted. In spite of the authors' optimism, and of their confidence in education as the great leveler in Puerto Rican life, the book does not confidently increase our understanding of social change in the island.

Morse (1960), taking a very different tack, strikes out at what he sees as overglib and superficial analyses of the "transformation" of Puerto Rico, and calls this transformation illusory. He wonders whether it is realistic to suppose that the island will really one day have "* * * la piedad católica, las tradiciones afectuosas de familia, el respeto artificial hacia la mujer y el individualismo espiritual y estético, y por el otro lado, el empuje, logro material y 'confort' y la eficiencia organizacional del mundo de los negocios yanqui" (1960: 358). Not only does he doubt the chances for such a hybridization, but he feels called upon to point out that all the United States would be supplying in such an amalgam would be method, technology, and money.

Morse takes issue with the common assumption (as suggested, for instance, by the work of Brameld, 1959, and Cochran, 1959, in their use of Gillin, 1955) that Puerto Rico is but a piece of some single culture sphere called "Latin America," without attention to the special history of the island. That history, he argues, has been poor in national symbols and in national triumphs, and the Puerto Ricans have real difficulty in creating a tough "national self-image" (autoimagen nacional). Puerto Rico cannot be a hybrid of two cultures because Puerto Rico was never really Spanish (in the sense in which much of the South American mainland was). The island society was too fragmented, isolated, dependent, and ignored for this—even the Catholic church had no profound success in establishing itself. Spanish culture was reduced to a framework, perchance a matrix, rather than being the basic structure of the society. Little group identity evolved, perhaps in part because of the isolation of the island, with its internal fragmentation due to limited development, poor communication, rigid class lines, etc. The lack of a group identity may be related, in fact, to the often-imputed "docility" of the Puerto Rican people; they tend to look for help from outside, not trusting their own initiative and suffering when faced with critical decisions. A culture that is docile in this way, Morse contends, has three characteristics: (*a*) The powers of self-criticism and of self-evaluation are retarded; (*b*) the people and the whole society are prey to fantasies because they lack a self-image forged in internal conflicts; and (*c*) the members of the society have difficulty in identifying public objects upon which to vent the hostility that all societies possess (1960:365).

Accordingly, Morse contends, the period of supposed "hybridization" and "transformation" has been one in which wishy-washy policies have developed, which are of no help to the Puerto Ricans in forming a picture of their own identity. Lacking a clear self-image, a clear purpose and a sense of national self, the Puerto Ricans lean too much on fantasy, and their docility hides hostility and frustrations; life swings between the extremes of apathy and frantic activity.

Obviously Morse is not denying that Puerto Rico has changed; he is arguing instead that it has not changed for the better, and that, in the essential terms of a national identity, it is as bemused as ever, if not more so.

An equally pessimistic picture, put somewhat differently, is given us by the work of Seda Bonilla (1964). Based on anthropological fieldwork in a north coast sugarcane community in 1948–49 and a decade thereafter, Seda's study provides an interesting series of insights about change. Seda sees the traditional rural family structure as deteriorating under the impact of higher consumption aspirations, migration, and the resultant inroads on familial and sexual stability. The traditional role of women is crumbling; they seek sexual pleasure for pay, leave their children with their grandparents, ignore the taboo on association with other males besides their spouses, and use their economic independence as a reassurance against the risks of a broken family. Young people admire the easy life of no obligations and little work. They reject the past, and have no use for the idea of the "hombre serio y formal" (1964: 49). They are bored, have little to talk about because they "know so much," and are passive and dependent ("cool"). They do not want manual work, yet lack the education to get clerical or skilled jobs; they tend to emigrate readily, and ridicule tradition and the old "jíbaro" customs (1964:51).

People fear being tricked (see also Landy, 1959; Brown, 1964); they incline to trust no one, and their children are often made promises that are not kept. Generosity is highly valued, but always suspect (1964: 113). People with authority are seen as "good" if they grant special favors. As with a small child, to be denied a favor by one in authority is to be branded as "bad." If a man does not grant a favor, it is because he is holding it back for a relative, or does not like the petitioner (1964: 115). To be denied is to be offended, and so people fear to ask for things; yet they depend on the favors of leaders, and receiving a favor means being in debt. The consolidation and institutionalization of political power, the growth in consumption standards, the easy "out" provided by migration—these have intensified dependency, fear of freedom, and cynicism, while leaving nothing better behind. People fear both being left helpless, and being free, since being free means each can do as he pleases, resulting in a sort of chaos.

Seda Bonilla's work is a fascinating introduction to rural life from a largely "culture-and-personality" orientation, and it contains many sharp insights. However, one has little feeling that the author really controlled in any reliable way his assessment of social change. His pessimism is quite noticeable, and his hopes for communities of the sort he studied are markedly reserved. I will not attempt to examine here the same author's work on attitudes concerning civil liberties in Puerto Rico; but this work does throw some extremely interesting light on the relativistic tolerance imputed to Puerto Ricans. One obvious reservation is that many of these data were collected by questionnaire, with the accompanying problems of confirming reliability.

In a short paper, Maldonado Denis (1963) tackles the question of change, but puts his emphasis on the political implications of such change. In his view, industrialization and "penetración cultural norteamericana" are different streams of influence, not to be confused with each other (1963: 143). People in underdeveloped countries develop a sort of cultural schizophrenia, based on the conflicts implicit in changes away from the traditional culture. In Puerto Rico's case, the culture conflict brought about by North American power has been intensified by industrialization. The economy is largely within the sphere of North American control, and political decisions of a fundamental sort still rest in North American hands. The author sees the solution of Puerto Rico's cultural problems as a political solution—the annihilation or continuity of Puerto Rican culture depends, in effect, on whether Puerto Rico becomes independent, for independence would preserve the culture, while statehood would destroy it. While of interest, this paper adds little that is useful in any weighing of change in Puerto Rico. Though quite different in political outlook, much the same may be said of Fernández Méndez (1955) (also see Benítez and Rexach, 1964). Lewis (1963), in an intimidatingly well-documented study, says much of great interest concerning the Puerto Rican society. I will not attempt its summary here; as in the case of Tumin and Feldman (1961), I have written a review of the book which summarizes my main contentions concerning it (Mintz, 1964).

A short paper by Fernández Méndez (1963) sketches rather superficially the effects of recent changes (particularly economic) on the

Puerto Rican family. The description is not based on fieldwork, and the tone is exhortatory rather than objective.

I had hoped that the materials provided by Brown (1964) might give new light on the consequences of change in Puerto Rico, but in fact the materials deal mainly with what could be described as a strikingly conservative and isolated rural subculture. It seems that nothing approaching the Steward-edited work for completeness and detail has appeared on Puerto Rico in the intervening decade, and I am unable to add much that is not impressionistic. I have referred in the body of my report to the study by Hernández Alvárez (1964), and to my own observations on a 2-day visit to a rural community this year (Mintz, 1965), but these data are sketchy, perhaps inconsequential. Given the enormous importance of recent social and cultural changes for any thoughtful analysis of contemporary Puerto Rico, I regret that so little of value can be said here about change.

SUMMARY

The five preceding sections of this appendix enumerate some of the best-known studies of Puerto Rico (with occasional references to "belles-lettres"), and give at least a sketchy accounting of some of their findings. Additional sections—for instance, political life at the community level, life-history studies, and religion—might well have been added, but for the pressure of time. I do feel these materials make clear the difficulties implicit in attempting to draw any single holistic picture of island culture or Puerto Rican identity. While many of the items mentioned under national culture and national values doubtless have a certain validity and generality, I believe it would be hard to make them into a "picture" of the Puerto Rican personality or national culture.

Especially galling is the lack of any suitable factual basis for the interpretation of the impact of change on Puerto Rican culture and values. The obvious consequences are just that—obvious; but these understandings give us neither a full grasp of the society nor any predictive power. If some additional fieldwork were possible, more analytic data would be forthcoming. I should repeat once more my own reservations about holistic analysis of the Puerto Rican case, and admit to the clear incompleteness of the materials assembled here.

Perhaps the major value of such an exercise might be in the extent to which it could provoke additional dialogue concerning island society. It would be most helpful—and I acknowledged my prejudices—were some of the more articulate commentators to attempt ethnographic fieldwork in order to fill out their assertions, both positive and negative, with the words and voices of the Puerto Rican people.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albizu Miranda, Carlos, and Héctor Marty Torres. 1958. "Atisbos de la personalidad puertorriqueña," "Revista de Ciencias Sociales," 2(3).

Alvárez Nazario, Manuel. 1961. "El Elemento Afronegroide en el Español de Puerto Rico." San Juan, Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña.

Andreu Iglesias, César. 1956. "Los Derrotados." Mexico, Los Presentes.

Barbosa-Muñiz, José C. 1964. "On Gordon Lewis' Article," "San Juan Review," 1(9).

Benítez, Celeste, and Robert F. Rexach. 1964. "The Puerto Rican identity problem," "San Juan Review," 1(7).

Blanco, Tomás. 1942. "El Prejuicio Negro en Puerto Rico." San Juan, Editorial Biblioteca de Autores Puertorriqueños.

Brameld, Theodore. 1959. "The Remaking of a Culture." New York, Harper and Brothers.

Brown, Jack. 1964. "Subcultures of Isolation in Rural Puerto Rico." Ithaca, N.Y. Mimeographed, pp. 59.

Cochran, Thomas C. 1959. "The Puerto Rican Businessman: A Study in Cultural Change." Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Curtin, Philip. 1955. "Two Jamaicas." Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Dexter, Lewis A. 1949. "A dialogue on the social psychology of colonialism and on certain Puerto Rican professional personality patterns," "Human Relations" 2(1).

Díaz Soler, Luis. 1953. "Historia de la Esclavitud en Puerto Rico." Madrid, Ediciones de la Universidad de Puerto Rico.

Fernández Méndez, Eugenio. 1955a. "Filiación y Sentido de una Isla": "Puerto Rico." San Juan, Editorial del Departamento de Instrucción Pública.

1955b. "Reflexiones sobre 50 años de cambrio cultural en Puerto Rico," "Historia," 5(2).

1959. "Criterios de la periodización cultural de la Historia," "Cuadernos," 17.

1963. "Algunos cambios culturales, económicos, y sociales que afectan la familia en Puerto Rico," "Revista de Ciencias Sociales" 8(2).

Fernández Méndez, Eugenio (ed.). 1956. "Portrait of a Society." Río Piedras. Mimeographed.

Figueroa Mercado, Loida. 1963. "Puerto Rico—cultura y personalidad," "Revista de Ciencias Sociales" 7(1-2).

Gillin, John. 1955. "Ethos components in modern Latin American culture," "American Anthropologist," 57(3).

Gordon, Maxine. 1949. "Race patterns and prejudice in Puerto Rico," "American Sociological Review," 14(2).

1950. "Cultural aspects of Puerto Rico's race problem," "American Sociological Review," 15(3).

Hanke, Lewis. 1949. "The Spanish Struggle for Justice in the Conquest of America." Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hernández Alvárez, José. 1964. "Una revisión de Cañamelar después de diez años," "Revista de Ciencias Sociales," 8(2).

Hill, Reuben. 1956. "Impediments to Freedom of Mate Selection in Puerto Rico," in Fernández Méndez, (ed.) 1956, q.v.

Hill, Reuben, J. Mayone Stycos, and Kurt Back. 1959. "The Family and Population Control." Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press.

Landy, David. 1959. "Tropical Childhood." Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press.

Lauria, Anthony Jr. 1964. "'Respeto,' 'relajo,' and Inter-Personal Relations in Puerto Rico," "Anthropological Quarterly," 37(2).

Lewis, Gordon. 1963. "Puerto Rico: Freedom and Power in the Caribbean." New York, Monthly Review Press.

Linton, Ralph. 1936. "The Study of Man." New York, Appleton-Century.

Maldonado Denis, Manuel. 1963. "Politica y cultura puertorriqueña," "Revista de Ciencias Sociales," 7(1–2).

Manners, Robert A. 1956. "Tabara: Subcultures of a Tobacco and Mixed Crops Community." In Steward, J. H. (ed.), 1956, q.v.

Manners, Robert A., and Julian H. Steward. 1953. "The Cultural Study of Contemporary Societies: Puerto Rico," "American Journal of Sociology," 59(2).

Marqués, René. 1963. "El puertorriqueño dócil," "Revista de Ciencias Sociales," 7(1–2).

Mellafe, Rolando. 1964. "La esclavitud en Hispanoamérica." Buenos Aires, Editorial Universitaria.

Mintz, Sidney W. 1951a. "The Contemporary Culture of a Puerto Rican Rural Proletarian Community." Ph. D. dissertation, Dept. of Anthropology, Columbia University.

1951b. "The Role of Forced Labour in Nineteenth-century Puerto Rico," "Caribbean Historical Review," 2.

1953a. "The Culture-History of a Puerto Rican Sugar-Cane Plantation, 1876–1949," "Hispanic American Historical Review," 33(2).

1953b. "The Folk-Urban Continuum and the Rural Proletarian Community," "American Journal of Sociology," 59(2).

1956. "Cañamelar: The Subculture of a Rural Puerto Rican Proletariat." In Steward, J. H. (ed.), 1956, q.v.

1959. "Labor and Sugar in Puerto Rico and Jamaica," "Journal of Comparative Studies," 1(3).

1960. "Worker in the Cane: A Puerto Rican Life History." New Haven, Yale University Press.

1961a. "The Question of Caribbean Peasantries: A Comment," "Caribbean Studies," 1(3).

1961b. Review of "Slavery," by Stanley Elkins. "American Anthropologist," 63(3).

1963. Review of Tumin, Melvin, with Arnold Feldman. "Social Class and Social Change in Puerto Rico." In "Economic Development and Cultural Change," 11(2).

1964. Review of Lewis, G. "Puerto Rico." In "Social and Economic Studies," 13(4).

1965. "A visit to Barrio Jauca: March 18–20, 1965." Ms., ditto, pp. 95.

Mintz, Sidney W., and Eric R. Wolf. 1950. "An Analysis of Ritual Co-Parenthood (compadrazgo)," "Southwestern Journal of Anthropology," 6(4).

Morse, Richard M. 1960. "La transformación ilusoria de Puerto Rico," "Revista de Ciencias Sociales" 4(2).

Muñoz Marín, Luis. 1924. "Porto Rico. The American colony." In Gruening, E. (ed.). "These United States." New York, Boni and Liveright.

Padilla Seda, Elena. 1956. "Nocorá: The Subculture of Workers on a Government-Owned Sugar Plantation." In Steward, J. H. (ed.), 1956, q.v.

Pedreira, Antonio S. 1946. "Insularismo." San Juan, Puerto Rico, Biblioteca de Autores Puertorriqueños.

Petrullo, Vincenzo A. 1947. "Puerto Rican Paradox." Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Redfield, Robert. 1941. "The Folk Culture of Yucatán." Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

1962. "The Natural History of the Folk Society," "Human Nature and the Study of Society," vol. I. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Reuter, Edward B. 1946. "Culture Contacts in Puerto Rico," "American Journal of Sociology," 52(2).

Ríos, José Mariano, and P. B. Vásquez Calcerrada. 1953. "A Social and Economic Study of Two Resettlement Communities in Puerto Rico." Río Piedras, University of Puerto Rico Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 114.

Rogler, Charles. 1940. "Comerío, A Study of a Puerto Rican Town." Lawrence, Kansas, University of Kansas Publications, Social Science Studies.

1946. "The Morality of Race Mixing in Puerto Rico," "Social Forces," 25(1).

1948. "Some Situational Aspects of Race Relations in Puerto Rico," "Social Forces," 27(1).

1949. "The Role of Semantics in the Study of Race Distance in Puerto Rico," "Social Forces," 22.

Rogler, Lloyd. 1965. "A Better Life: Notes from Puerto Rico," "Transaction," 2(3).

Rosario, Charles. 1958. "Dos tipos del amor romántico: Estados Unidos y Puerto Rico," "Revista de Ciencias Sociales," 2(3).

Rosario, José C. 1930. "The Porto Rican Peasant and his Historical Antecedents." In Clark, Victor S., et al., "Porto Rico and Its Problems." Washington, D.C., The Brookings Institution.

Rosario, José C., and Justina Carrión. 1940. "Problemas Sociales: El Negro: Haití—Estados Unidos—Puerto Rico." San Juan, n.p.

Saavedra de Roca, Angelina. 1963. "Algunos valores prevalecientes en la sociedad puertorriqueña," "Revista de Ciencias Sociales," 7(1–2).

Sapir, Edward. 1956. (1924) "Culture: Genuine and Spurious." In Mandelbaum, D. (ed.), "Culture, Language and Personality." Berkeley, University of California Press.

Schurz, William L. 1949. "Latin America." New York, Dutton.

Seda Bonilla, Edwin. 1957. "Normative Patterns of the Puerto Rican Family in Various Situational Contexts." Unpubl. Ph.D. diss. Dept. of Anthropology, Columbia University.

1961. "Social Structure and Race Relations," "Social Forces," 40(2).

1963. "La cultura y el desarrollo económico: el caso de una comunidad puertorriqueña," "Revista de Ciencias Socalies," 7(1–2).

1964. "Interacción social y personalidad en una comunidad de Puerto Rico." San Juan, Ediciones Juan Ponce de León.

Sereno, Renzo. 1947. "Cryptomelanism," "Psychiatry," (10).

Steward, Julian H. (ed.). 1956. "The People of Puerto Rico." Urbana, University of Illinois Press.

Stycos, J. Mayone. 1955. "Family and Fertility in Puerto Rico: A Study of the Lower Income Group." New York, Columbia University Press.

Suttell, L. 1955. "Puertorriqueño ciento por ciento." In Fernández "Méndez, E. Filiacion y Sentido de una Isla: Puerto Rico." San Juan, Puerto Rico, Editorial del Departamento de Instrucción Pública.

Tannenbaum, Frank. 1947. "Slave and Citizen." New York, Alfred A. Knopf.

Tugwell, Rexford G. 1956. "*Dignidad* and its implications." In Fernández Méndez (ed.), 1956, q.v.

Tumin, Melvin, with Arnold Feldman. 1958. "Social Class and Social Change in Puerto Rico." Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Tylor, Edward B. 1877. "Primitive Culture." New York, Henry Holt.

Vásquez Calcerrada, Pablo B. 1953. "The Study of a Planned Community in Puerto Rico." Río Piedras, University of Puerto Rico Agricultural Experiment Station, bulletin 109.

Vientos Gastón, Nilita. 1964. "The Identity Problem: Part Two." "San Juan Review," 1(9).

Wells, Henry. 1955. "Ideology and Leadership in Puerto Rican Politics," "American Political Science Review," 49(1).

Williams, Eric. 1956. "Race Relations in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands." In Fernández Méndez (ed.), 1956, q.v.

Wolf, Eric R. 1956a. "San José: Subcultures of a "Traditional" Coffee Municipality." In Steward, J. H. (ed.), 1956, q.v.

1956b. "Aspects of Group Relations in a Complex Society: Mexico," "American Anthropologist," 58(4).

1959. "Specific Aspects of Plantation Systems in the New World: Community Sub-Cultures and Social Class." "Plantation Systems of the New World." Pan American Union Social Science Monographs, VII. Washington.

Wolf, Kathleen. 1952. "Growing Up and its Price in Three Puerto Rican Sub-Cultures," "Psychiatry," 15(4).

Zavala, Silvio. 1964. "The Defence of Human Rights in Latin America (16th to 18th centuries)." Tournai, Belgium, UNESCO.

---

[1] This presentation is admittedly very sketchy. A behavioral trait (knife-using, shot-wearing, the use of a particular word or of certain grammatical forms, styles of dress, etc.) may have to be acquired beforehand in order to change one's status; some "successful" people take pride in maintaining some behavioral traits exactly because they are symbols of behavior of members of a lower status group; parents may push their children toward new manipulations of cultural materials to prepare them for upward status mobility; and so on. In the case of Puerto Rico, many culturally nationalistic middle class persons regard those poorer and more rural than themselves as more authentically Puerto Rican; but this is because the depressed status of the rural poor so often has kept them from taking on the symbols employed by those more fortunate than themselves.

[2] The first edition was published in 1934.

[3] Cf. app. B for a discussion of these points.

[4] Rosario (1930) has written a sketch on the "peasant" useful in this connection.

[5] The late Clyde Kluckhohn, anthropologist, sought to get at what might be called "national character" through studies of group values. In an appendix prepared by Mrs. Jane Collier, a tentative application of the Kluckhohn approach to Puerto Rican materials is offered. It must be emphasized that this work was base don written materials only, and involved no fieldwork. All the same, the findings are of some interest.

Wolf's brilliant paper on Mexican group relations (1956b), and Lauria's exploration (1964) of Puerto Rican interpersonal relations deal with "social idiom"; the work of Kathleen Wolf (1952) makes valuable use of child-training data for Puerto Rico; and Steward's associates (1956) employed social history very significantly in their analyses.